

THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY REPORTER;

UNDER THE SANCTION OF THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

No. 20.]

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 23RD, 1840.

[PRICE THREEPENCE.

This day is published, demy 8vo, price One Shilling,
**AMERICAN CHURCHES THE BULWARKS OF
AMERICAN SLAVERY.**

BY AN AMERICAN.

May be had at the Office of the British and Foreign Anti-slavery Society, 27, New Broad Street; of Messrs. Harvey and Darton, 55, Gracechurch-street; Hatchard and Son Piccadilly; and Ball, Arnold, and Co., Paternoster Row.

**THOMAS CLARKSON, ESQ. AND THE AMERICAN
COLONIZATION SOCIETY.**

(*To the Editor of the Anti-slavery Reporter.*)

SIR,—During a recent visit to Playford Hall, our venerable friend, Thomas Clarkson, Esq., intimated to me that he had addressed a letter to Mr. Garrison, giving him his present views of the American Colonization Society. The document having been read to me, I solicited a copy for publication in your forthcoming number, which was kindly granted, and which I now transmit to you for that purpose.

The present opinion of Mr. Clarkson on the claims of that society to support is the more important, as he gave to it formerly the weight of his sanction and his name, and from his most valuable letter it will be seen how these were obtained and abused. As Mr. Clarkson had been grossly imposed upon in this country by the agent of that society, so one of his communications to the United States respecting it was garbled and altered to suit its purposes, and, when the fraud was detected, the apology of one of its officers in effect was, "had Mr. Clarkson himself been here and known all the facts of the case, he would have so written."

It may be well to remark that, at the very time Mr. Cresson was imposing his fictions on Mr. Clarkson, he knew that the most abominable doctrines were boldly advocated in the accredited documents of the Society. In them it was maintained that property in slaves was to be respected as "SACRED"—that "the society has at all times recognized the constitutional and LEGITIMATE existence of slavery"—that "it protests that it has no designs on the rights of the master over the slave—or the property in his slave which the laws guarantee to him;" and that its object, rightly understood, involved "no intrusion on property, NOR EVEN UPON PREJUDICE." Its most zealous supporters went even further than this; they asserted that it would guard the system of slavery, and "contribute effectually to its continuance and strength;" that "the execution of its scheme would AUGMENT instead of diminishing the value of the property left behind;" that it would "provide and keep open a drain for the excess beyond the occasions of profitable employment;" that the value of slaves thereby would be "ENHANCED!" and that "INTO THEIR ACCOUNT THE SUBJECT OF EMANCIPATION DOES NOT ENTER AT ALL." As to the abolitionists, they were denounced as "enthusiasts" and "fanatics," and were thus apostrophized; "Come, ye abolitionists, away with your wild enthusiasm and misguided philanthropy."

It is worthy of remark, also, that all its presidents, viz., C. F. Mercer, Bushrod Washington, Charles Carroll, and Henry Clay, (who at present fills that office) have been, and those of them who still live are slave-holders, and that not one of them has manumitted a single slave to be sent to their favourite colony of Liberia! In the first annual report of the society, Henry Clay is stated to have said, that "it was proper again and again to repeat, that it was far from the intention of the society to affect in any manner the tenure by which a certain species of property is held. He was himself a slave-holder; and he considered that kind of property as inviolable as any other in the country." And during the last session of congress he declared that he was decidedly opposed to all schemes of abolition, whether immediate or gradual, however remote, and would oppose them. The fact is, the society was instituted for the sole purpose of removing the free people of colour from the United States, as a NUISANCE from which it were a blessing for society to be rid!

According to the best account we can obtain, not more than 6000 persons altogether have been removed from the United States of America to Africa, during a period of twenty-three years, or about 260 per annum, which is scarcely equal to the daily increase of the slaves in that country; and such has been the mortality, that it is believed that the number of settlers in the colony at this time is not so great as the number which has been transported thither. As to the "free people of colour,"

they have been unanimous in their opposition to the society from its commencement, and have nobly determined to abide by their brethren in bonds.

But I will no longer detain the attention of your readers from the important communication of Mr. Clarkson.

I am, &c.

JOHN SCOBLE.

London, 22nd Sept., 1840.

DEAR SIR,—When you was in England on a former occasion, you did me the favour to call upon me at Playford Hall, to take a part against the "Colonization Society." Long before this visit, my friend Mr. Elliot Cresson had engaged me in its favour, so that I fear that I did not show you the attention and respect (while you was at my house) due to so faithful an apostle of liberty. You have lately been in England again, but your numerous engagements prevented you from seeing me, though it was your intention to have done so, and to have conversed with me on the same subject. I understood from your friends in London, who sent me a message to that effect, that you wished to know the particular reasons why I have changed my mind with respect to that society. I have no objection to give you a short account of the reasons which induced me to enter into it, and finally to abandon it.

My attention was first drawn to this subject by Mr. Elliot Cresson, who said that there was at that moment an almost universal desire in the people of the United States to abolish slavery and the slave-trade, and that he and they had a plan for this purpose. The plan was to emancipate all those men in bondage there, and to send them to Africa, the land of their fathers, where they were to buy land and form colonies, on the principle of civilizing the natives thereof, teaching them christianity, and of preventing the slave-trade in their immediate neighbourhood, as well as of trying to put an end to it in other parts, wherever their influence might reach. This desire or disposition in the American people to accomplish so glorious a work was, he said, almost universal. It was not confined to the clergy, or persons of superior intellect, or high moral character, but it extended through the various classes of society, even to the planters themselves, who were then deeply convinced of the sin of holding their fellow-creatures as slaves, so that slaves for transportation might be bought for £7 10s. each—(the sum calculated to pay their passage.) Many masters were so convinced of the sin of slavery, that they would emancipate and were then emancipating their slaves for nothing, that is, without any pecuniary consideration, or on the condition only that they should be sent to Africa, and comfortably provided for there. Upon this universally prevalent disposition the Colonization Society was founded, and a district to be called Liberia, on the western coast of Africa, was fixed upon for the purpose: this was the account given me by my friend Mr. Cresson, and I own that I was overcome with joy and carried away by it. I thought it was one of the sublimest plans ever devised. Here the two great evils of slavery and the slave-trade were to be done away at one and the same time in the United States. But that circumstance which astonished me the most was, that there should have broken out all at once, and over the whole land, such a sunshine of benevolent feeling; that men should suddenly and all at once have given up long established customs, and the rooted prejudices of ages; and that the hardened hearts of planters should have been all at once melted and softened, and their consciences so smitten as to have acknowledged slaveholding to be a sin, for which they were anxious to make reparation at a great sacrifice, namely, the free emancipation of their slaves. These feelings on the part of the American people were not to be accounted for upon any ordinary principle. I thought that nothing but the spirit of God could have worked such a miracle, and that, as it was His will that the blessing of freedom should come to American slaves through the means of the Colonization Society, we were bound most thankfully to accept the boon. My astonishment was so great at this miraculous change of things, that I questioned my friend Mr. Cresson over and over again, if his account was not exaggerated. He replied always that it was strictly true—and these were the reasons why I patronized the society in the very beginning of its formation.

I began now to think very seriously on what had been at different times related to me on this subject; and first, how such an immense work was to be accomplished. Nearly two millions and a half of slaves were stated to be then in the United States; and all these were to be transported to Africa. It struck me, that no private funds could be collected by Mr. Cresson, either in

England or in America, sufficient for this purpose that it was in fact, and ought to be a government work, and I told him *my fears* that he would never accomplish his object. He told me in reply, that besides subscriptions by individuals, the different states in the Union would each give its quota of money towards it, sufficient to transport all the slaves within its own districts or boundaries. He then showed me one or two American newspapers, in which it appeared that one of these states, Virginia I think, had already promised a very large sum, *some thousands of dollars* to the work, and he believed the rest of the states would follow the example. Thus my fears were quieted as they related to this part of the subject. I do not know whether Virginia has to this day fulfilled her promise. On going more deeply into this subject *new fears* rose up to my mind. I began to think that, if the slaves in the United States amounted to the *immense number* reported, with the population every day increasing by birth, *no man* then living might see this good work brought to an end, and that during all this time, that is during their transportation, all the horrors of slavery would be going on among those who were left behind. I determined, therefore, to satisfy myself on this point, and therefore, when I saw my friend Mr. Cresson next, I inquired what was the state of Liberia; how many emancipated persons had been already imported into it; and what was the number annually expected to be brought into it. I gathered from him, as far as I can now recollect, that between two and three thousand had already come into it, and that more were on their way thither; but that, if I waited a little time longer, he could give me a better answer. I accordingly waited for some months, when I found that the recruits began to come in *much more slowly than before*, and that, judging by the last importations, or the number then imported in a given time, I could not expect that more than 1000 or 1500, or at the most 2000 emancipated slaves could be *then counted upon to be sent annually into Liberia*. This alarmed me, and I began to think that some difficulties had occurred in the way of the emigration; either that the *funds were then not equal to the transportation of more*, or that *more could not be procured*. *Not more than 2000 at most* could be expected to be brought into the colony *in a year*, whereas not less than *1000 per day* should have been sent to that and other parts of the continent of Africa, to get rid of a population of between two and three millions in any reasonable time. No person, if Mr. Cresson's plan were followed up in *such a slow and lingering manner*, could hope to see the extinction of slavery in the United States in less than 500 years, if at all. Nor even could they take off by such a slow process even the rising generation as they were born, nor, if the American government were to take the plan into their own hands, could they *in any reasonable time* accomplish the work, were they even to give to the project *every shilling of the surplus revenue in their treasury*, and *employ their whole navy in the transportation of those people*, taking in the rising generation, and all the difficulties which would occur. Even they, the American government, could not accomplish it in less than fifty years.

I considered, therefore, Mr. Cresson's plan, so far as related to the removal of these unhappy people, as *impracticable* within the life time of any man then living, and I told him so repeatedly, but I could never get a satisfactory answer from him; nor can any satisfactory answer ever be given to show that the scheme is practicable, and this ought to weigh with those, who, if this society still exists, *have a desire to enter into it*. Let such persons moreover consider that this society has already existed, I believe, for upwards of twenty years, and that there is *not a slave less in the United States now* than when they began their work. Indeed, notwithstanding all their efforts, during all this time there are *hundreds of thousands more*, in consequence of the increase of population, than when the plan was first proposed, the slave population according to the best accounts amounting now to *nearly three millions*. I may say further, that if this society still exists, it is criminal; for to hold out that their scheme would produce the *entire extinction of slavery in America*, (and this was held out with an inconceivable obstinacy) what was it, or what is it, but to delude the public as well as themselves, and to teach people to *rely upon this one measure*; whereas if their scheme had never been proposed, they would have been looking out for *some other remedy or cure*.

But I began to have other fears as I looked into the subject farther, from a very different view of it. I began to question whether the persons to be sent out were the *proper persons to found a new colony* in an uncivilized part of the world, and whether they would not do *more harm than good*. The natives of Africa, besides being called upon to abolish the slave-trade in their own territory, were to be *improved in their morals*, to be *civilized*, to be *christianized*; but *were slaves newly emancipated fit persons to carry on such a work?* And yet by the scheme such and such alone, except the officers, were to be employed in it. The scheme had reference *only to those who were then slaves*, and who were to be made free on the occasion, that is, just before the sailing of the vessels which were to convey them to their new homes. Now it is obvious that, if these people were to be sent to Liberia and other parts of the same continent, they would go there with *all the vices of slavery upon their heads*. Theft, lying, prevarication, and trickery of every kind are the characteristics of a slave, brought on inevitably by the vicious system under which he had been obliged to live. To this are to be added the brutal and superstitious notions which such people must have; their want of education and of any

knowledge of civilized life; but above all, their want of any moral principle to guide them, and their total ignorance of God and religion. Now I did not think that people of this description were fit to be sent to Africa to *form a pattern colony* for the imitation of the natives there, for they were not persons of a *pattern conduct* themselves. These were my thoughts upon this part of my subject, and I mentioned them several times to Mr. Cresson. He said that hitherto he had taken all the care he could to make a selection, but admitted that 120 of this description had come into Liberia amongst the last importations. He candidly confessed that he did not see how he could help himself on a future occasion, indeed he spoke only the truth; for the scheme related *only to those who were then in bondage*, and who, as soon as ever they were emancipated, (however unfit they might be) were to be the component parts of the new colonies in Africa.

You will see in this narrative my reasons for patronizing at first the "American Colonization Society," and my reasons also for having afterwards deserted it. I left it, first, because it was *entirely impracticable*. This is a *sufficient reason* of itself, for no man in his senses would pursue a plan which he thought could never be accomplished. I left it, secondly, because I thought that *newly emancipated slaves* were not qualified to become colonists in Africa to any good purpose. How could persons be sent with any propriety to civilize others, who wanted *civilizing themselves*? Besides the advocates for the Colonization Society in America had no right to send the *scum* of their population to Africa, to breed a moral pestilence there. As far, however, as the *abolition of the slave-trade* in Africa is concerned in the plan, it must be allowed that Liberia has done a great deal of good. But then this was the *first colony* planted, and the people sent there, as Mr. Cresson assured me, were more select. Many of these had been emancipated a considerable time before, and had got their own living, knowing something of the habits of civilized life. My argument relates only to *newly emancipated slaves*, who, according to the scheme, were to be hurried off from the plantations as soon as their liberty was given them. If the Society did not take these people, then the prospectus offered to the public had no meaning in it, and slavery could never, according to its promises, be *extinguished* in the United States.

Since writing the above, I have learnt from an American paper that a skirmish has taken place between the colonists of Liberia and the people of Gaytoombah's town. I know nothing of the causes of this apparently little war, but am grieved to learn, when the skirmish was over, that a most wanton, deliberate, cold-blooded act of butchery was practised by the *missionaries themselves*; who boasted that, while the people of Gaytoombah's town were gathering up their dead, they had the *best chance of any to fire into their groupes*, and when they had turned their backs, to "pepper their hams with buck shot." This was too bad, and contrary to the usages of war among civilized nations; but to rejoice in, to boast of, to make a joke of such a murderous deed, belonged only to *savages*, and yet these men were, we repeat, missionaries, *disciples of the Prince of Peace* and perhaps, *leading men* in the colony. What effect such barbarous conduct will have upon the natives, to prevent future colonies from being settled on their coast, we may perhaps live to see. The news of this massacre will certainly be spread by the Kroomen all over the African coast, and the Colonization society may be deprived of the power of making further purchases in Africa, except in their own immediate vicinity, where they may have done some good. If this should ever be the case, they may bid farewell to their future hopes. Where then will they provide land on this continent for three millions of emancipated slaves?

But I have not done with the subject yet. Mr. Cresson had hardly left England the last time, when new information was given me on this same subject, by two American gentlemen of the *very highest moral reputation*, by which I was led to suppose two things—either that I had mistaken Mr. Cresson in his numerous conversations with me, or that he had allowed me to entertain erroneous impressions without correcting them. It was true, as my two friends informed me, that there had actually been a great stir or agitation in the United States on this subject, and quite as extensive and general as Mr. Cresson had represented it to be; but that the cause of it was *not a religious feeling*, as I had been led to imagine, by which the planters had been convinced of the *sin of slavery*, but a base feeling of fear which seemed to pervade all of them, and which urged them to *get rid of the free people of colour* by sending them to Africa. These people were more knowing, intelligent, and cultivated than the slaves, and it was believed were likely to join them, and be very useful to them in the case of an insurrection, so that, if these were once fairly sent out of the country, they, the planters, might the more safely rule their then slaves with a rod of iron. This information was accompanied by an account, by way of proof, taken from American newspapers, of different meetings held by the friends of the Colonization society in different states of the Union, and of the speeches made there. It appeared from these speeches, that the most violent supporters of this society were *planters themselves*, and that the speakers did not hesitate to hold out the monstrous and hateful proposition that the negroes were *not men and women*, but that they belonged to the *brute creation*. It was impossible to read these speeches, which were so many public documents, and not perceive that the persons then assembled were no friends, but bitter enemies to the whole African race, and that *nothing in the*

way of good intentions towards the negro could be expected from them. It is unnecessary for me to attempt to describe what my feelings were upon this occasion. I will only say that I saw the scheme, shall I say the diabolical scheme, with new eyes; and that the new light thus thrown upon it, added to the two arguments before-mentioned, determined me to wash my hands clean for ever of the undertaking.

With respect to my dear and revered friend, Mr. Wilberforce, I will tell you what was his opinion on this subject. He saw Mr. Cresson through my introduction, and having heard patiently all that Mr. Cresson had to say in favour of his scheme, put this important question to him, "Why, when the government of the United States have millions of acres of land, whole states indeed, at their disposal, why do you send them to Africa for a new home, when you can locate them in the country in which they were born, and to which they have a claim by birthright, and on account of services to the community?" Mr. Cresson never answered this question so as to satisfy Mr. Wilberforce, and Mr. Wilberforce would not stir a step till it was answered. His opinion was that, if congress were composed of just and honest men, they would locate these slaves in a territory neighbouring to their own, and make a separate state of them, and have them represented on the floor of congress; or that they would send them to a great distance, making an allied state of them there, and sending proper officers and magistrates with them to live among them, and to put them into the way of governing themselves. But he gave the preference to the former measure; he always thought that there was something hidden in Mr. Cresson's plan, which was purposely concealed.

I have now given you my reasons for having once patronized the Colonization Society, and then deserted it, and hope you will consider them satisfactory.

I am, dear sir, with great esteem,
Very truly and cordially yours,
THOMAS CLARKSON.

To W. L. Garrison, Esq.

WEST INDIA MISREPRESENTATIONS.

THE friends of humanity in Great Britain stand in no need of being informed that the pro-slavery party in the West Indies have indulged long and largely in a habit of unscrupulous misrepresentation, and have made it a point to deluge this country with statements adapted to produce the effect they desire, caring little how far they may be from describing accurately facts or occurrences abroad. Plausible misrepresentation answers its purpose here long before it can be corrected from the distance of half the globe. And besides, it is only to scatter misrepresentations by thousands, and the very trouble of doing it will prevent the greater part of them from being answered at all. These are still the favourite tactics of the party, and to a considerable extent, unhappily, they are still influential. A clever and imposing article of this class appeared in a respectable and generally trustworthy contemporary of ours on the 13th of May last, under the form of "extracts from private letters," with which the editor had been favoured by a highly respectable merchant in the city. It so happens that this has attracted the notice of one of our correspondents in Jamaica, who has favoured us with the following commentary and explanation. *Ex uno discere omnes.*

I HAVE seen with much disgust, in the *Colonial Gazette* of the 13th of May, extracts from the *Jamaica Standard* and from private letters, which give very exaggerated and very gloomy pictures of the condition of this island. I am astonished that the *Colonial Gazette*, a paper which I thought had some pretensions to fairness, should attach any importance to or quote from a paper which has no reputation, and but very limited circulation in its own locality, and which from the hour of its commencement has been unequalled for scurrility, and unceasing in its lamentations over the beneficial progress of freedom; and which is constantly reiterating the cry of ruin to the colony, by consequence of the interference of Baptist ministers and stipendiary magistrates—malicious lying assertions, which have as often been triumphantly refuted as either of those calumniated bodies have had public or official opportunities of meeting their accusers or slanderers. Nothing can be more atrocious and dishonest than this unceasing cry of ruin, kept up by the lowest portion of the Jamaica press, in direct opposition to and in the midst of the strongest evidences of commercial and agricultural prosperity which any country can exhibit. Imports rapidly and amazingly increasing—the price of land advancing—the domestic comforts and moral condition of the people wonderfully promoted and improved—missionary stations, churches, chapels, school-houses, and buildings for other purposes, spreading in all directions throughout the island—and the absence of pauperism and vagrancy—if these be evidences of a state of prosperity, then is this island eminently prosperous. It would be but retributive justice to the supporters of the infatuated and unprincipled men, who are unceasing in the clamour of ruin, ruin! if their cuckoo cry should at last be credited, and their bills returned by the British merchants protested.

In one of those extracts of letters I have alluded to, a contrast is made of the crop of 1825, with what is termed the crop of 1840 in the district of Blue Mountain Valley, St. Thomas in the East. I say *termed* the crop, for, as the letter is dated 27th March, 1840, and in that district the crop only commences generally in February, and does not terminate until June and July, it was impossible for the writer to know accurately what the crop would be. It is evident that the object of the writer is to depreciate Jamaica property, by practising on the credulity of individuals in England interested in it; but weak indeed and childishly disposed to alarm must they be, if, instead of perceiving the insidious design of their correspondent, they suffer themselves to be persuaded into the performance of any act which will betray a want of confidence in the security, and, under proper management, the profitableness of pro-

perty in this island. Why, if the object of their correspondent was to draw a fair conclusion, did he not compare the crop of 1840, if he knew what the crop was, with the crop of the previous year, or even with that of the last year of slavery, 1833, and 1834? What satisfactory result could be obtained by a comparison of one year of unfettered labour with one crop of slavery, fifteen years ago, about the bloodiest and darkest period he could have selected out of the annals of slavery in that district? As you may not have seen the statement of this oracular correspondent of a London merchant, I extract it for your amusement, and for your amazement, should you be credulous enough to believe it.

"In addition to the West Indian intelligence derived from public sources of information, we have been favoured by a highly respectable merchant in the city with the following extracts from private letters.

"Jamaica, 27th March, 1840.—I wrote you per last packet, and have since received your letter of the 1st February. The assembly have again met, and are progressing quietly and peaceably with what they have to do; nevertheless, all their labours will fall far short of what we require—population, population; and without this, sugar cultivation must recede, let them pass what laws they will. We are improving so little that, if the good folks in England saw our present cultivation, they would say, 'you need it.' I only returned from Blue Mountain Valley yesterday, and the state of the whole district was such as to bring to my recollection the prophecy of the Bible as regards Jerusalem; it is indeed desolate, and although we have succeeded in getting a few more acres planted than last year, still if even we continue to improve, it will be some years before the estates pay their expenses. For instance, I give you the crops of 1825, and 1840: viz.

	In 1825.	In 1840.
Garbrand Hall	570	50
Coley	200	40
Serge Island	250	45
Blue Mountain	400	60
Petersfield	400	11
Hall Head	180	14
Mount Pleasant	140	55
Georgia	120	20
Mount Lebanon	60	20
Buckingham	200	30
White Hall	80	8
Golden Valley	100	20
Spring Garden	200	7
	2900	380

And I believe it to be just as bad in many other parts of the island. These are facts, and require no great sagacity to know what will be the result. Many must be thrown up; and the end will be the parcelling out of these very estates to the certain ruin of the few that remain. The blacks from America are too expensive for poor estates: they may answer in Trinidad or Demerara, but the majority in Jamaica never can afford the wages now given, much less the rate that would be expected by them. Let government assist, and send us one or two millions, or even two hundred thousand, from Africa, and it would serve us, and civilize them also."

At that period, so confidently alluded to as one of great prosperity, when so large an amount of sugar was made on Blue Mountain and Petersfield estates, so reckless was the waste of human and animal life, and so unbounded the extravagance in all the details of plantation management, especially in the hire of large jobbing gangs to dig cane holes and clean the ample fields of canes which were requisite to produce those boasted crops, that the result entailed enormous debt on both those properties. Petersfield was soon after placed under the charge of an attorney appointed by the mortgagees, but the slave gang being fearfully diminished by mortality occasioned by excess of work and harsh treatment, its crops were much reduced, and continued from henceforward to decline. During the apprenticeship there were differences between the labourers and the proprietor, which, while the estate continues in his hands, will always be an impediment to its successful cultivation. The proprietor of Blue Mountain estate, when acquainted with the circumstances attendant on the fictitious prosperity of his estate, immediately changed his attorney, reduced the cultivation, forbade the employment of jobbing gangs, took measures to ensure humane treatment to as great an extent as possible under a constrained servitude, and by a rigid economy in the management, with 120 hogsheads netted more than he had done with 400 under the former reckless and extravagant system. The soil of Garbrand Hall estate is very light and sterile, and with constant cropping it had been worked down in the last years of slavery to little more than 120 hogsheads. From such like causes, long before the abolition of slavery, all the estates in the Blue Mountain district had reduced their produce to an amount hardly exceeding in any instance half of that which the correspondent of the London merchant has thought it honest to advance as a test of the success of the same estates under freedom. But, independently of any reference to slavery or apprenticeship it can be proved that there are circumstances connected with the treatment of the people on many of the estates in that district since the termination of the apprenticeship, quite sufficient satisfactorily to account for the less prosperous condition of it, as compared with other parts of the same parish. It appears to me that it must be a matter of indifference to the owners of landed property in Jamaica, whether they derive their income from sugar, or from some other cultivation, or from rent, provided it be an adequate one. Then why was it not stated by the writer of that fair and candid epistle, who, professing to have so minute a knowledge of that district, could not have been ignorant of the fact, that, independently of the sugar made, be it much or little, the proprietor of Garbrand Hall estate has a rent roll from negro tenants considerably exceeding £1000 per annum? And why did he not also state, that the Messrs. Kirkland, experienced planters in that parish, had offered £1000 a-year rent for that estate, and that they had made the same offer for Hall-head estate, and had been refused by Mr. Hall, the proprietor? Now, presuming that he, as proprietor of Hall-head, had some little knowledge of his own affairs, and that the Messrs. Kirkland had their perceptive organs, if not as largely developed as the correspondent of the London merchant, who saw only wire grass, rushes, and trumpet trees, at least sufficiently so to form some notion of self-interest from what they saw, when they inspected these estates preparatory to making their offers; then these facts tend to prove

a state of things very different from that desolation so eloquently described by the correspondent of the London merchant, and which so forcibly brought to his recollection "the prophecy of the Bible respecting Jerusalem!" Were I not afraid of exhausting your patience I could multiply instances in which similar offers have been made for other properties in the same locality. I cannot, however, conclude without remarking, that it is notorious to all persons connected with the plantations or the commerce of this colony, that there is a very great and anxious desire on the part of experienced planters to become leaseholders of estates: while so confident are the majority of absent proprietors and mortgagees of the prosperous condition of the colony, that very few can be induced to see that their interest consists in either residing on and managing their properties themselves, or in leasing them to trustworthy persons in the island. On the contrary, many of them appear to consider the same arrangement which prevailed during slavery, of attorney, overseer, and factor, can still be successfully pursued; an error by which they may eventually be made to suffer serious pecuniary injury. Fortunately, the wealth and happiness of the inhabitants of this colony are now in no way dependent on the prudence or prosperity of a few individuals on the other side of the Atlantic. The security of property being established, and the industry of the people placed beyond all doubt, British capital will flow hither so long as it can be made to yield a return beyond what it can produce by any legitimate use in the mother country; and in the event of all the old proprietary of estates being compelled, by their fears or their imprudence, to sell out, it will, instead of a calamity, be the most fortunate and favourable circumstance that could happen to the colony, as a means by which a resident proprietary body would be created, or, what is equivalent, a class of leaseholders, between whom and the labourers there would be an unity of interest.

THE JAMAICA MARRIAGE ACT.

An act to legalize, register, and confirm marriages by dissenters, and other ministers, not connected with the Established Church, (11th April, 1840.)

Preamble. I.—Whereas it is expedient and necessary to provide for the due and proper celebration and registration of marriages by dissenters and others not connected with the established church, and to remove any doubt concerning the validity of certain marriages before celebrated. *Be it therefore enacted by the governor, council, and assembly of this your Majesty's island of Jamaica, and it is hereby enacted by the authority of the same.* That from and after the passing of this act all marriages solemnized by dissenting ministers, under the regulation hereinafter mentioned, shall be valid and effectual to all intents and purposes, any law, usage, or custom to the contrary in anywise notwithstanding.

II.—*And be it further enacted,* that from and after the passing of this act it shall be lawful for banns of marriage between parties desirous of being joined together in matrimony, to be published in any registered place of religious worship, and such publication shall be made in an audible manner, some time during public divine service on a Sunday, in the face of the congregation to which both or one of the parties whose banns are published shall be considered to be attached, and shall contain the christian or other name and surname, and place of abode of each of the said parties, and shall be so published for three Sundays preceding the solemnization of the marriage during the moring service, if there be any service in the morning, or if there shall be no morning service, then during the evening service; and if the parties to be married shall be of different congregations, the banns shall be published in like manner before each of the congregations to which the said parties may respectively belong, whether both the said congregations shall assemble in the same parish or not; and in cases where the banns shall have been published in different places, the officiating minister at either of the said places, shall, at the request of both or either of the said parties whose banns shall have been published as aforesaid, give to the party requiring the same a certificate of the banns having been published in the place of which he is an officiating minister; and on the production of such certificate to the officiating minister of the other place where the banns were published, or of such certificates to any other minister as aforesaid, it shall be lawful for such minister on receiving such certificate or certificates (one or both as the case may be) to solemnize matrimony between the said parties according to such form or ceremony as shall be in use, or be adopted by the persuasion to which the minister solemnizing such marriage shall belong. *Provided,* that whenever the form and ceremony used shall be other than that of the United Church of England and Ireland, each of the parties shall in some part of the ceremony make the declaration according to schedule B.* *Provided always,* that during the period when such banns are published, the names of the parties whose banns are to be published shall be posted on the principal door of the chapel where the banns are published.

III.—*And be it further enacted,* that no minister shall be obliged to publish banns between any persons whomsoever, unless the persons to be married shall two days at the least before the time required for the first publication of such banns respectively, deliver, or cause to be delivered, to such minister a notice of their true christian and other names and surnames, and a description of their place or respective places of abode; and it shall not be lawful for any minister to solemnize any marriage after three calendar months from the last publication of the banns of such marriage; and in all cases where three calendar months shall have elapsed without the marriage having been solemnized, the publication of such banns shall be void; and before the said parties can be married by banns, it shall be necessary to republish banns anew, as if no banns had ever been published between them.

IV.—*And be it further enacted,* that no such minister as aforesaid who shall solemnize any marriage after due publication of banns as aforesaid between persons, both or one of whom (not being a widow or widower) shall at the time of such marriage be under legal age, shall be answerable, or responsible, or liable to any pain, penalty, or proceeding for having solemnized such marriage without the consent of the parents, or guardians, or other persons (if any) whose consent is required by law, unless such parent, or guardian, or other person, or one of them, shall forbid the marriage, and give notice thereof to such minister before he has solemnized the same; and in case such marriage shall be forbidden as aforesaid, and such notice shall be given as aforesaid, the publication of the banns for such marriage shall be absolutely void.

V.—*And be it further enacted,* that from and after the passing of this

act, no dissenting minister shall solemnize a marriage except in his chapel, and in the presence of two or more credible witnesses; and all chapels in which it is intended to solemnize marriages shall be registered in the office of the island secretary. *Provided,* that no marriage to be performed by a dissenting minister, after the passing of this act shall be good or valid, if performed before the banns shall have been published as aforesaid, and in any place other than the chapel to be registered as hereinbefore directed.

VI.—*clause makes any person wantonly forbidding publication of banns, or solemnization thereof, without authority for so doing, liable to a penalty of £10, or imprisonment for two months.*

VII.—*clause, provides that examined copy of registry shall be sufficient proof of marriage.*

VIII.—*clause, provides that no writ or proceedings shall be had to compel the celebration of any promise of marriage, or by reason of seduction, &c. Proviso, aggrieved party may sue for damages.*

IX.—*And whereas, it is necessary to preserve evidence of the solemnization, and to make the proof thereof certain and easy, and for the direction of such ministers as aforesaid in the registration thereof. Be it therefore enacted, that from and after the passing of this act, all marriages shall be solemnized in the presence of two or more witnesses beside the minister who shall solemnize the same, and that immediately after the solemnization of every marriage, an entry thereof shall be made in a marriage register-book to be kept for that purpose by every such minister as aforesaid, in his own handwriting; and in every such entry in every such register it shall be expressed that the marriage was had by banns, and shall be signed by the minister with his proper addition, and by the parties married, and shall be attested by such two witnesses, and every such entry shall be in the form annexed to this act in schedule C, and of every such entry at the same time before the parties depart shall then and there be made, on a separate piece of paper, parchment, or vellum, a duplicate original register, in which the same matter shall be entered, and signed, and attested, by the same parties, in the form annexed in schedule D, which said duplicate original register shall be left in the hands of the minister by whom the marriage was solemnized; and every such duplicate original register shall within three calendar months from the date thereof, be transmitted to the island secretary, and all such duplicates shall be filed and safely preserved, and to be by him recorded in books to be kept for that purpose in his office, and every such original register, and also every copy thereof certified under the hand of the island secretary to be a true copy, shall respectively be good evidence of the facts therein recorded, in pursuance of this act, in and before all courts and proceedings whatsoever, in which it shall be necessary to give evidence of the marriage to which the same shall relate.*

X.—*And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, that any minister who shall solemnize any marriage under and by virtue of this act, and shall be guilty of negligence or wilful default in the registration or copying of the entries of such marriages, and transmitting the same to the office of the secretary, in the manner directed in and by this act, shall be deemed and considered to be guilty of a misdemeanour, and upon conviction in the supreme court, or any court of oyer and terminer, shall be punished by imprisonment for a period not exceeding twelve months for every such offence.*

XI.—*Provides that parties may search original register and take certified copies, except on Sundays and holidays.*

XII.—*And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, that in order to meet the expense, and as a remuneration for the trouble occasioned by the performance of any duty under this act, the fees stated in schedule E annexed to this act, shall be demandable and paid by the parties applying, before the performance of the duty to which the same respectively relate.*

XIII.—*Provides that persons unlawfully or wilfully destroying, or obliterating, &c., original register or duplicate, shall be guilty of felony, and liable to imprisonment for two years. In case of forgery parties may be imprisoned for three years.*

XIV.—*Whereas it appears that dissenting ministers have been accustomed to marry in their chapels and elsewhere, and to keep a registry of the names of the parties, their residence, and the date when the ceremony was performed, together with the names of witnesses in some cases. And whereas it is expedient that such registries should be recorded and open to the inspection of the public; be it further enacted, that within six months after the passing of this act all ministers not of the Church of England shall, and they are hereby required to, send a copy of the registry of all marriages solemnized by them, which they have registered before the passing of this act, to be verified by the oath of the party who shall have registered the same—or in the event of his death or absence from the island, by the oath of some one to whom his handwriting is known, to the office of the island secretary, there to be kept and recorded, and an examined copy of such registry or record thereof shall be received as evidence in all courts of justice in this island of such marriage.*

XV.—*And be it further enacted, that all marriages solemnized by dissenting ministers before the passing of this act, and so registered and returned into the office of the island secretary, shall be, and they are hereby declared to be, as good and valid as if performed according to the rites of the Church of England, any law, usage, or custom to the contrary in anywise notwithstanding.*

XVI.—*And be it further enacted, that if any such minister as aforesaid shall wilfully make and sign any such declaration, knowing the same to be false, he shall be liable on conviction thereof to suffer the pains and penalties to which persons guilty of wilful and corrupt perjury are liable.*

XVII.—*And whereas, in consequence of imperfect instruction in the christian religion, and from other causes, many marriages *de facto*, have taken place, but which marriages *de facto* have not been sanctioned by any public ceremony, or formally registered, and in many such cases the parties have had offspring of such last-mentioned marriages, and it is expedient that provision should be forthwith made for enabling such persons to confer upon their children the benefit of children born in lawful wedlock. Be it therefore further enacted, That it shall be lawful for all persons, having contracted marriage as last aforesaid, at any time within one year after the passing of this act, duly to solemnize the marriage ceremony before any clergyman of the Established Church, or in any other manner authorized by this act; and every person so recognizing a previous marriage *de facto* shall, at the same time, make and sign the following declaration, which shall also be attested by the witnesses present, and signed by the minister before whom the ceremony is performed.*

* These declarations are copied from the English act.

"We A B and C D do hereby severally, solemnly, sincerely, and truly declare that on the day of in the year of or thereabout, at we the said A B, and C D intermarried with each other, and that we have had issue of the said marriage children, and no more, namely—(here state the names and ages of the children, and if any be dead state the fact.)

(Signed)

A B. C D."

And such marriage ceremony shall have relation back to the time of the marriage *de facto*, and all such children shall be deemed and taken to have been born in holy wedlock, and shall possess and enjoy all the rights and privileges, and advantages of persons born in lawful wedlock; and to preserve evidence thereof, a duplicate original declaration shall then and there, before the parties depart, be made, signed, and attested in the same manner, and the original declaration shall be appended to and kept with the original register, and the duplicate original declaration shall be appended to, sent, and kept with the duplicate original register, and shall for all purposes of evidence be deemed part thereof, respectively: *Provided always, and it is hereby declared*, that such last-mentioned ceremony and declaration may be performed and made without the previous publication of banns. *And provided always*, that nothing in this act contained shall defeat any grant heretofore made by the crown.

XVIII.—*And be it further enacted*, that any person who, after the passing of this act, shall knowingly and wilfully solemnize any marriage in this island, except by license, in any other place than a church or chapel in which marriages may be solemnized according to the rites of the Church of England, or than the chapel to be registered under the provisions of this act, shall be guilty of a misdemeanour (except in the case of a marriage between two Roman Catholics according to the usage of their church, or of two of the society commonly called Quakers, according to the usage of the said society, or between two persons professing the Jewish religion, according to the usage of the Jews,) and every person who, in any such registered chapel, shall knowingly and wilfully solemnize any marriage in the absence of witnesses, or before the publication of banns for three successive Sundays, shall be guilty of a misdemeanour, and on conviction thereof shall be imprisoned in the discretion of the court for any time not exceeding twelve calendar months.

XIX.—Provides that persons wilfully detaining marriage register, shall be guilty of misdemeanour.

Docket of fees demandable by this act.

For registering a marriage, and transmitting the duplicate original to the island secretary, the sum of two shillings and sixpence.

For every certified copy of entry of marriage as aforesaid, the sum of one shilling and threepence.

Foreign and Colonial Intelligence.

UNITED STATES.

WELCOME OF MESSRS. COLVER AND GALUSHA AT BOSTON.—[From the *Massachusetts Abolitionist*.]—The Rev. Mr. Colver went to the convention at London as a delegate from the Massachusetts Abolition Society, and from the National Baptist Anti-slavery convention; and Rev. Mr. Galusha, from the Baptist convention and the American and Foreign Anti-slavery Society. Both returned in the Acadia, and on Wednesday evening last it was our privilege to attend a meeting of the Abolition Society to welcome their return, and listen to statements from them of the doings of the great convention. The meeting was held in the Melodeon. Josiah Brackett, Esq., was called to the chair, and the meeting was opened with prayer by Rev. Luther Lee. Mr. Colver then addressed the large and attentive audience present, in a series of most interesting statements and remarks, giving a brief but impressive view of the character, the proceedings, and the probable influence of the convention, and of the aspects of the anti-slavery cause generally in Great Britain. He was followed in a few additional statements by Mr. Galusha. The remarks of both speakers drew forth repeated expressions of applause from the meeting, and at the conclusion the following resolution was adopted.

"Resolved.—That, as friends of the enslaved, this meeting has listened with pleasure to the statements that have now been made in reference to the proceedings of the late convention in London, of the friends of the enslaved from different parts of the christian world, by Messrs. Colver and Galusha, delegates to that conference from this country; that in the character, the proceedings, and the results of this first meeting of the representatives of the friends of the enslaved throughout the world, we witness a new era in the history of efforts for the universal extinction of slavery and the slave-trade, and that we rejoice especially in the high ground so unanimously taken by said meeting in regard to the duty of the christian church; that, in view of the whole, we are cheered with the assurance that the day is near, when, by the verdict of the civilized world, slavery will universally cease; and that, grateful to Almighty God for their safe return, we bid the delegates who have now addressed us a hearty welcome to their native land, and to renewed labours for the deliverance of enslaved millions in our midst."

The meeting was one of unusual interest, and will exert, we doubt not, a happy and abiding influence for the slave.

THE ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTION.—We take from the *Massachusetts Abolitionist* the following extracts of a letter from Mr. Norton, of Connecticut, one of the American delegates.

I have never witnessed such an unremitting attention on the part of delegates to any convention, as was the case on this. The sittings were as well attended on the last day as on the first. The delegates seemed to feel, one and all, that they had come there on business of importance, and I scarcely witnessed a feeling of impatience throughout the whole. A calm and deliberate determination was evinced to look at the subject of slavery wherever it existed, in all its relations—to obtain all the light in their power, and to endeavour to arrive at such results as would, by the blessing of Providence, tend to remove the evil.

But to be more particular, I will allude to the *character* of the convention, and to its *component parts*. So far as it has been my privilege to witness the assemblages of distinguished men, I have never seen anything

like so great a number of individuals who gave such striking evidence of genuine respectability, intelligence, and piety.

The spirit that animated the convention was eminently, I think, a *christian spirit*. There were great diversities of religious and political views, but all seemed determined that nothing inconsistent with the spirit of the gospel, as cherished by all evangelical denominations of christians, should enter into their proceedings, yet that all minor differences should be dropped. If I have ever been permitted to realize what it was to participate in proceedings bearing the stamp of genuine christian influence, this meeting was begun, continued, and ended with such an influence. If for a moment, at any time, a different spirit seemed about to intrude, there were individuals present who seemed so imbued with the spirit of truth and love as to be enabled to calm the troubled waters.

I had not expected to be so constantly interested as I was in the details of the convention. But there was no room for weariness for any one who had a heart to feel, or a desire to do, for his suffering fellow-men. "All the oppressions that exist under the sun" were reviewed, and there were individuals present competent to interest the meeting under each head.

I cannot but think that much good will result from this great convention. All who were present felt "that it was good to be there." The four hundred individuals who were concentrated on that occasion were warmed, enlightened, and encouraged, and each will serve, I trust, as now scattered and diverging to their several and distant places of abode and influence, to impart some portion of that warmth and light to others.

THE RIPLEY PRESBYTERY.

JULY 22nd, 1840.—The committee appointed to report on the doings of the late general assembly, state that they have discovered several things in the proceedings of that body which demand the special notice of this presbytery, and all others that regard the character of the church, and the principles of righteousness and humanity.

1. It appears that the assembly refused to bear testimony against the sinful and cruel practice of slave-holding. Such a fact is sad evidence of a low state of moral feeling in that body. What can be hoped with respect to the piety of an ecclesiastical body that would refuse to declare the holding of immortal beings as property a sin? That the assembly believed that slave-holding is both sinful and cruel, and that many members of the church were guilty of it, will not be denied. And that it had excited much controversy in the church was well known. Consequently it was a matter properly within the sphere of the assembly, and one upon which the constitution of the church made it a duty to act. Form of government forty-five. "To the general assembly also belongs the power of deciding in all controversies respecting doctrine and discipline; of reproofing, warning, or bearing testimony against error in doctrine, or immorality in practice, in any church, presbytery, or synod." To this may be added some injunctions of the sacred scriptures. Lev. xix. 17. "Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thine heart; thou shalt in anywise rebuke thy neighbour, and not suffer sin upon him." Isaiah lviii. 1. "Cry aloud, spare not, lift up thy voice like a trumpet, and shew my people their transgressions, and the house of Jacob their sins." Ezek. xxxiii. 7, 8. "So thou son of man, I have set thee a watchman unto the house of Israel; therefore thou shalt hear the word at my mouth, and warn them from me—if thou dost not speak to warn the wicked from his way, that wicked man shall die in his iniquity; but his blood will I require at thy hand." Is it not obvious to every reflecting mind, that the members of the assembly, in refusing to bear testimony against the sin of slave-holding, did violate both their own constitutions, and these sacred precepts? Did they not refuse to reprove those living in the practice of a grievous sin?

2. It appears that after a large number of the members, believing the business closed, had left the assembly, a secret meeting was held, and the following preamble and resolution was presented and passed.

"Whereas it appears from memorials sent to this house, that several presbyteries have passed resolutions excluding slave-holders from their pulpits and from their communion, and whereas our constitution requires that no member of the presbyterian church shall be disenfranchised without a regular trial; and whereas, this proceeding is a repetition of the excising acts of the New Basis assembly, against which we have taken our stand as friends of the constitution; therefore Resolved, that the said presbyteries be requested to rescind such resolutions."

The secret manner in which this was presented, discussed, and passed, gives the impression that there was a consciousness on the part of the members of that assembly that motives and influences must be introduced in this case which would not bear public scrutiny. There was evidently a want of that openness which always attends a consciousness of well doing. "He that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh he to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved."

3. The fact that this preamble and resolution were presented and passed at the close of the session, after many had retired from the assembly, and others were anxious to leave, and when there was little time either for discussion or deliberation, cannot fail to give the impression that there was the design of taking the advantage of absent members, and of an hour of anxiety and confusion, to force through a preamble and resolution that would likely have fallen by fair and open discussion in a full assembly.

4. The preamble and resolution presents such ignorance of the constitution of the church as is highly disgraceful to a general assembly, while it is painful evidence that they were passed without mature deliberation. Would a general assembly upon mature deliberation have sustained the assumptions in this preamble? What clause in the constitution did the presbyteries in question violate? What members of the church did they disfranchise without trial? And whom did they excise from the church? They neither violated the constitution, disfranchised without trial, nor excised a single individual. All the assumptions made against the presbyteries are false. These presbyteries are in free states, have no slaveholding ministers among them, and they have declared that they will not admit such to their pulpits nor to their communion; that is, they will not admit ministers belonging to other presbyteries known to be slave-

holders, either to preach in their pulpits or to commune in their churches. Now a general assembly ought to have known so much, as that the ministers of one presbytery have no constitutional right to occupy the pulpits of another presbytery, nor to commune in their churches without leave from the constituted authorities. Former assemblies did know this much. The assembly of 1798 decided as follows: "It shall be deemed irregular for any presbytery to appoint supplies within the bounds of another, without their concurrence; or for any minister to officiate in another congregation without asking and obtaining his consent, or the session's in case the minister be absent; yet it shall be esteemed unbrotherly for any one, in ordinary circumstances, to refuse his consent to a regular member, when required." Assem. Di. page 60. According to this decision, each presbytery has exclusive jurisdiction within its own limits, and each minister exclusive power in his own pulpit. Consequently, the presbyteries in question violated no constitutional principle in excluding slave-holders from their pulpits and their communion. They did simply what they had a right to do. In doing it they neither disfranchised nor excommunicated any one. It was merely excluding them from the courtesies commonly extended to persons in good standing. The intercourse between churches, presbyteries and synods, is voluntary and unconstrained by the constitution, and regulated only by the rules of Christian courtesy and brotherly love. Hence, presbyteries have the right to exclude from their pulpits and their communion, such as belong to other presbyteries, whenever they deem it necessary for the purity or peace of their churches, or to the honour of religion in general.—It is amazing that a general assembly should have passed such a preamble and resolution. It seems as if the Lord had sent upon them a strong delusion, and given them up to expose themselves to the contempt of an intelligent community. A few such decisions will shake the confidence of the world in general assemblies.

5. The resolution must be viewed as an attempt on the part of the assembly, by its influence, to thrust slaveholding preachers into the pulpits and fellowship of the churches of the free states, and by this means to extend the power and influence of slavery, and fasten again its deadly fangs into the heart of a church from which the providences of God have nearly broken it off. Such encroachments demand resistance at the very threshold, and should redouble the efforts of every one who fears God and loves liberty.

6. The presbyteries are requested to rescind their resolutions, and admit slave-holders to their pulpits and their communion! And why? Is slaveholding not a sin? Did the assembly mean to say by this resolution that slaveholding is not criminal? Or did they mean to tell us to tolerate in our communion men living in the sin of open and continued oppression, and that in defiance of all the light developed by the most extended discussion ever known on earth? What an exhibition of human depravity! A general assembly ask presbyteries to take slave-holders to their pulpits and their communion! Men who buy and sell the very members of Jesus Christ! Did they request slave-holders to let the oppressed go free? Never! That would have made disturbance in the church! But will it make no disturbance in the church to thrust slave-holders into the pulpits and upon the fellowship of the churches of the free states? Why all the fear of disturbance on the one side? There is the fixed design to protect slavery at the expense of the rights of those who oppose it. To have had such an assembly will be matter of humiliation to our branch of the church to a thousand generations.

7. The preamble and resolution do not seem to imply that the scriptures require the presbyteries to receive slave-holders to their pulpits and their communion; but that this obligation arises from the constitution of the church. To exclude them is a violation of constitutional principle. Why did not the assembly tell us that it is a violation of the injunctions of the scriptures? Why did they not urge upon the presbyteries the duty of submitting to the authority of God in this matter? The answer is easy, they did not believe that the scriptures required the admission of slave-holders to fellowship in the church. And can a human constitution oblige us to do what the Bible forbids? Can men make laws to annul the laws of God? Did the assembly mean to teach us that the constitution is of higher obligation than the word of God? This seems to be implied in their preamble and resolution. And what is this but "teaching for doctrines the commandments of men."

The scriptures alone prescribe the terms of communion, and no ecclesiastical body has the right of changing them. The sin of oppression is as clearly forbidden as the sin of adultery, murder, theft, or drunkenness. Suppose the presbyteries in question had passed resolutions declaring that ministers known to be guilty of adultery, murder, theft, or drunkenness, should be admitted to their pulpits or to their communion, would the general assembly have requested them to rescind such resolutions? Would they ask us to admit to our pulpits and our communion a known adulterer, a known murderer, a known thief, or a known drunkard, although there had been no formal trial, and there could be none, because the presbytery to which he belonged would not try him? He lives openly and confessedly in one of these sins, every one knows it, and his presbytery knows it, but will not exercise discipline, because such sins are popular and common among the best classes, and ever have been tolerated since the constitution was formed. Can any human law compel presbyteries to admit such a man to their pulpits and their communion? Such is the case of the slaveholder. He openly lives in the practice of oppression in its worst form. Slaveholding involves in it the sin of adultery, murder, and theft; it is the parent of these sins and many others, and because the sin is popular and common among the best classes in slave states, and ever has been tolerated in the church since the constitution was formed, presbyteries refuse to exercise discipline. They not only persist in tolerating oppressors in their communion, but license and ordain them to preach the gospel! And a general assembly asks the presbyteries in the free states to fellowship such presbyteries, and to receive known oppressors to their pulpits and their communion! Such conduct in an assembly is making void the law of God, and giving license to sin. It is no better than popish indulgence. They ask presbyteries to admit to their pulpits and their communion those that are known to be living and persevering in the worst of sins.

The presbyteries in question have acted in accordance both with the scriptures and the constitution. They have a right to withdraw from every brother that walketh disorderly. 2 Thess. iii. 6. "Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the tradition which he received from us." 1 Cor. v. 11. "But now I have

written unto you not to keep company, if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner; with such an one no not to eat." Does not the slave-holder walk disorderly while he holds human beings as property? Is he not a fornicator so long as he upholds a system that promotes fornication? Is he not covetous when he urges his slaves to unrequited labour? Is he not an extortioner while he continues to extort from his fellow-beings their liberty and services? Individuals and presbyteries then are commanded to withdraw from all such, not to keep their company, nor even to eat with them. And yet a general assembly has asked us to take them into our pulpits, and to eat the Lord's supper with them! What a shame! Is this the assembled wisdom and piety of the presbyterian church?

WEST INDIES.

JAMAICA.—Mr. Candler has addressed a letter on the state of this island to the editors of the Chelmsford paper, from which we take such parts as are not a repetition of his letter to Mr. Clarkson.

'The change effected in their civil condition, though very great, and at last somewhat sudden, has served to elevate their character in the estimation of all observers. I expected on landing to find a race who having been always oppressed, treated with contumely, and trod upon, would continue to exhibit some traces of their former degraded condition, some marks of servility that belonged to the slave; but in passing through the country from one end to the other, I should scarcely believe from what I see that slavery had ever existed here. Freedom has wrought wonders for the people: there is an air of independence in their carriage and manner, when they meet and converse with you, that is quite astonishing, equal to that of the freest nations; not bold and obtrusive, but attended with a civility and courteousness that are very pleasing, and tell much in their favour. The prognostications and prophecies of the planters and the proslavery press, that the negroes on coming to freedom would prove an idle vagabond race, that the proprietors would be ruined, and the colony go to decay, are all happily falsified, as their friends always said they would be, by the most gratifying facts. The peasantry of Jamaica are beginning to reap the reward of their own industry, and peaceful and loyal conduct, in a steady increase of wealth and accumulation of comforts; and the prospects of the proprietary body in the continued cultivation of sugar and coffee, its staple productions, are now more cheering than for several years past. It must be confessed that during slavery, horrible as the system was, a large number of people, by the sale of surplus provisions, pigs, and poultry, had saved money; since some of them, immediately on receiving their freedom, brought out their hoards of silver and gold, became purchasers of land, built themselves houses, and settled down as small independent freeholders. The free settlements which began to exist from the great day of freedom are now extending in all directions, and there will soon be a sufficient number of industrious, intelligent, black and coloured freeholders (if there be not already) to return a majority of the members of the house of assembly. The island, however, is not yet altogether in a settled state, nor the industry of the labourers brought to a fair test, owing to continued paltry squabbles about rent and wages. Many short-sighted managers of the old school continue to oppress: and justice, I am sorry to say, is not always administered in the courts of petty session, where the local magistrates, who are planters, sit to adjudicate. The charges of oppression almost all originate from a determination to compel labour and coerce wages through the medium of rent; which, as here used, is a screw of enormous power, and applied only for evil. The greater part of the labourers are living on the properties where they were born, in small clay houses (the cost of which to erect does not exceed ten pounds sterling), in close sequestered villages, almost hid in the bush; the plantains, the bananas, the bread fruit, and cocoanut trees, which they planted with their own hands are there; the burial places of their fathers and mothers, marked by rude stones, are there; and all the pleasing thoughts of early life, few indeed in number, and because few the more cherished, are associated with their birth spot; and poor as the spot often is, to leave it is a banishment. To these villages, always homely but often highly picturesque, the common people feel a strong attachment, and the managers of estates, unwisely for themselves and the absent proprietors, take an unfair advantage of this natural feeling. They want labour, and labourers are not over-abundant; they want also cheap labour, and are resolved to obtain it by every means in their power. The houses and provision grounds of the labourers belong to them, and they have a right, they say, to do what they like with their own. Instead of allowing the tenant, as sound policy and common sense would dictate, to continue to occupy his house and garden at a fair rent, leaving him at liberty to carry his labour to the best market, the master says to him, "You live on my property, and must work five days in the week for me; I will give you the usual wages; I shall charge you half a dollar a week for rent; but, if you go off this property and work anywhere else, you shall pay me a dollar a week, or quit." The usual wages thus promised are, of course, the lowest anywhere given, and this sort of bargain, if that can be called a bargain to which only one party consents, by fixing the labourer to a single spot, deprives him of all the benefits of competition, and leaves him a sort of *adscriptum glebae*, half a slave and half a freeman. This conduct he looks upon as unjust; it rankles in his bosom; he works sulkily; he receives only fifteen pence, or perhaps a shilling a day, whilst others close at hand, or only a little way off, live in their own freeholds, and receive eighteen pence; and, resenting the injustice, he leaves his employer in search of better pay. The latter now interferes with his rent authority, charges him a dollar a week, instead of half a dollar, for every week in which he has quitted his employment for a single day, and sues him for the amount at petty sessions, as for a debt due. The attorney-general, O'Reilly, little to his credit as a lawyer, less as a man, has given it as his opinion, that this must be considered a *rightful debt*, and where the local magistrates sit alone, or form a majority of the court, the defendant must pay the deodand and costs, or go to prison. Rent, in one shape or another, is the *questio verata* of the colony: settle this point fairly and amicably, and little or nothing would remain to disturb its quiet. You may perhaps say, the labourers have the power to settle this question themselves; they have only to quit, and go and live elsewhere. That is perfectly true, but they cannot do this without a wrench. Many of them, and these, as we might suppose, the best workmen, who have saved a little money, do so: they buy land, sometimes at a high price, often without a good title, and leave; but what can a man do who has a large family, with little or no money in reserve, and nowhere

to put his head? He must continue to work on the same property till he can make money, and this requires time: he looks out, as he says, for a "bit of his own," and silently resolves to leave his master as soon as he can. And yet many managers of estates, men of old-time principles, absolutely prefer this wretched alternative of securing labour by compulsion, running the risk of ruining the estates of absentee proprietors, to the straight-forward, honest method of leaving labour free, and by fair and kind dealing securing it for a continuance! I could mention some curious instances in which some of these parties have fallen into their own snare sooner than they looked for: the properties for which they act are deserted, the rents are lost, the fields are neglected, and everything about them is left to decay, except as they choose to pay a high price for labour to strangers to preserve it from ruin. "They sowed the wind, and they reap the whirlwind." The governor, Sir T. Metcalfe, much to his honour, reprobates this state of things, as tending, more than anything else or all other things put together, to prolong the dissensions of the colony, and is endeavouring with the help of a few of the more enlightened proprietors, to effect a change for the better, in which he may probably soon succeed. Experience keeps a dear school, and some men are slow to learn, but open their eyes at last. If the wealthy Earl Dudley and Ward would descend to bestow a passing glance on some of his large properties in Clarendon and Vere, he might see something to edify him. There are not four field labourers now resident on Rhymesburg, one of his estates, and on Whitney estate, where a short time since he had nearly three hundred people, only eight cottages remain inhabited!—Ask those who have been slaves, what they think of freedom—the men often take off their hats and the women kneel, and all, with seeming sincerity, lift up their hands and eyes to heaven, "O, massa, freedom too sweet, freedom, my sweet mistress, too sweet; thank God and all good friends in England; thank the good Redeemer for giving us freedom." Some of the planters still insist upon it that they are an idle people, because they do not on the whole perform as much work as in slavery; but who that has seen them at work in the cane fields, or hoeing coffee on the steep hills, or has travelled among their provision grounds in the mountains, can call them an idle people? I have seen them again and again, hundreds and thousands of them, men, women, and children, loaded with provisions and fruit, which they carry on their heads, pouring down from the hills to Kingston market, carrying weights which no European would encounter, and sweating under the heavy toil; yet all labouring cheerfully, because they are free.

JOHN CANDLER.

BRITISH GUIANA.—THE MANAGER AND FAMILY PRAYER.—[From the *Guiana Reformer*.] The beginning of the unhappy feeling on plantation Tuschen de Vrienden, which caused the labourers to abandon that place, is to be traced to the arbitrary and ungodly interference of the manager (C. M. Ross) with their religious exercises in the morning and evening. These people are all, or most of them, members of a christian church in connexion with the Kirk of Scotland, and, like all other christians, consider it their duty to pay their "morning and evening sacrifice" to him who is their Creator and Redeemer. But this state of things, it appears, does not accord with the system of a sugar plantation—it does not produce more sugar, it interferes with plantation discipline, and probably introduces insubordination. The head man received a severe reprimand for "allowing the people to meet together in his house." He ought to be "the last man to encourage" the people to pray, and the manager "will not allow any more of their meetings." However, like true christians, for man they did not care; thinking it truer wisdom to obey the divine injunction, "men ought always to pray," than those who would interfere with matters affecting their eternal interest. At the next meeting a messenger from the manager presented himself, with orders to disperse the meeting; to which the people returned as answer, that "the manager must come himself" to do it. The poor drudge of all work which is to be found on our plantations—the overseer, next made his appearance. This individual arrived whilst the people were listening to one of their number who was reading the bible; a chair was offered, which he tremblingly occupied until the reading was over, when he rose and stammered out—"ladies and gentlemen, I am very sorry to interrupt you in your exercises, but you know orders must be obeyed; I am directed by the manager to break up this meeting." Break up a religious assembly? an assembly of freemen, gathered together for no earthly purpose, but a heavenly one—to worship God? This circumstance is one of the strongest traits of the spirit of slavery which can be exhibited; and they very well know that this was one of the strongest weapons with which the people of England hewed down the monster of the West Indies—slavery; and it cannot be possible that they will permit it now. The fact is, the more ignorant and irreligious the people the better for our planters, with few exceptions. The savages and idolaters from Africa and Hindostan are the only race of men to answer their purposes; hence their unrelaxing exertions to get them.

TRINIDAD.—(From a private letter dated 21st July, 1840.)—No diminution has taken place in the value of property, nor are judicial sales of estates quite so frequent as they were during the accursed time of slavery. The Woodbrook estate, which is the nearest to Port of Spain, and consequently one of the oldest and most nearly worn out sugar estates, and is without any woodlands in its vicinity, the owner, the lion, H. Murray, asks one hundred thousand dollars for £20,000. The Curep estate was on the 4th of last month, at judicial sale, adjudged to a Mr. Joyeux for £32,500 currency. The honourable gentleman above mentioned, it must be remembered, was one of the foremost men who expected ruin to be the consequence of freedom.

THE DANISH ISLANDS.—Of all the West India islands those belonging to Denmark occupy the smallest part of public attention, so that months and even years sometimes elapse without any notice of them at all. Some accounts from those colonies, however, which appear in the American papers last received, contain facts of some interest, arising chiefly from the question of emancipation, which has been raised there among the slave population, in consequence of the completion of that measure in the British colonies. The dates are from St. Thomas's to the 12th, and from St. Croix to the 8th ultimo. To the latter the governor had lately returned from the coronation of his King and Queen, the latter of whom is favourable to the abolition of slavery, though a difficulty is offered in the circumstances of the Danish government, which is too poor to make compensation to the

proprietors. The governor, acting on the advice of the royal family, proposes that the planters should allow their slaves every Saturday, that they may be enabled to earn money to purchase their freedom. It is proposed that this act should be a voluntary act, and that the planters should not be compelled to grant their slaves this privilege, and hence, though some have agreed to the plan, the greater number will not consent, unless forced, saying, that it is asking them to give away one-sixth of their estate without compensation; nevertheless, those who have allowed their slaves the privilege have indirectly acted on the neighbouring estates, for the slaves, perceiving that those in their proximity did not work, followed their example. So prevalent was the notion that the governor had actually papers from the new King to emancipate the slaves, that the latter in great numbers met him as he landed and cheered him. The planters, as well as the slaves, are in favour of emancipation, but the former would have a compensation, and are on this account against allowing the Saturday. An insurrection broke out at St. Thomas's, and the governor, though generally in favour of the slaves, ordered the ringleader six lashes and imprisonment. Curious as it may appear, the negroes side with their masters, considering the government oppressive for not paying the compensation; and some even spreading a foolish report that the governor has received the money and spent it. On one estate the negroes, far from appreciating the governor's kind exertions to get them their Saturday, told him that it was not one day in the week, but freedom that they wanted.

The greatest caution has been taken to prevent desertion from St. Thomas's and St. John's to Tortola, since, that being a British island, the blacks are free as soon as they reach it. A Danish brig of war has been stationed between St. John's and Tortola to intercept flight, and her boat lately gave chase to another belonging to a free negro who was taking to Tortola a female and five male slaves. At first the boat's crew hailed them, then fired over their heads, and at last, firing into them, wounded the woman and one man, but all escaped to Tortola. The woman has since died, and the governor of Tortola has sent to the governor of the Danish isles to investigate the affair, as the negroes contend they were fired on when on British ground, and this is denied by the Danish officers. A similar inquiry formerly took place at Demerara, when some Dutch negroes got beyond the boundary river, which was passed by their owners in the heat of pursuit. They were captured, but the English declared the seizure unlawful, on the principle that a slave becomes free directly he touches British ground, and the Dutch were obliged to send the blacks to Demerara.

It is estimated that there are about 20,000 slaves in the Danish islands, the average value of which, taking old and young together, would be about 100 dollars each. Of the whole number, about one-third belongs to the King as owner and mortgagee of estates. The expense of emancipating the rest, according to the average, would be about 12,000 dollars.—*Times*.

SIERRA LEONE.

(From the *Liverpool Mercury*.)—We have received the following communication from a gentleman long resident in Sierra Leone, and but recently returned. The information which it conveys is important, and shows the necessity of some more effective measures for the prevention of the slave-trade than any that have yet been adopted. It will be seen that a vessel belonging to this port has been seized, and condemned as a slaver:

By the schooner Henry McCormick, (late the Courtenay) we have accounts from Sierra Leone to the 13th of August, the date of the above vessel sailing. The colony, generally speaking, was healthy, but the missionaries out but a short time from England had suffered severely, and many had died. The governor was well. Mr. Macaulay, the mixed commission judge, had been sojourning at the Banana Islands to recruit his health, which had been a good deal impaired by unremitting attention to the duties which his office imposes upon him. He was about to leave for England, via Ascension, in the Wanderer man of war. The men of war on the station occasionally call in—the Harlequin, Wanderer, and Persian. The Wanderer was going into Sierra Leone as the schooner came out.

Several vessels had been brought up and condemned for being connected with the slave-trade. The Plant, under American colours, with a slave cargo, detained by her Majesty's brig Persian, from Lagos, arrived on the 24th July—not yet tried. The San Pablo Loando, from the Havana to the Galinas, condemned and cut up. Two New York pilot-boats—one condemned and cut up as Spanish property; the other one waiting adjudication. The brigantine Anna, prize to the Saracen, taken off the Galinas about the 22nd of July, had not reached Sierra Leone. The English brig Guyana, belonging to Mr. Logan, a merchant of Liverpool, was condemned on the 12th of August for aiding and abetting in the slave-trade. It appears this vessel sailed from Liverpool on the 17th of October, 1839, with a general cargo to Bahia, to Edwards and Co., and was there chartered, through the agency of the same house, and with the sanction of the British consul, (Mr. Wheatley,) to carry a cargo of merchandise to the coast of Africa, touching at various places for the purpose of trading. That on the 26th of March, in lat. 43° N., and long. 5 W., her Majesty's schooner, Viper, Lieutenant Burslem, brought her to by firing a shot. After overhauling her, a prize crew and officers were put on board, with orders to take the vessel a prize to Cape Coast, and from thence to Sierra Leone, where she lay 102 days before she was condemned. The cargo is not yet disposed of. The aquadiente has nearly all leaked out, and the roll tobacco, from the heat of the climate, the length of time it has been exposed, and the rough usage it has received, must have been rendered useless and unsaleable. As the decision with regard to this vessel will naturally lead to inquiry, and as it is important in a commercial point of view, the above particulars may not be without interest.

The merchants complain very much of the frequent sales of the slave cargoes brought into Sierra Leone ruining their business, and not without much reason. They also complain very much of the little attention, on the part of the colonial authorities, to the complaints made by the merchants of the aggressive acts of the natives in the neighbouring rivers adjacent to the colony, the factories of the colonial merchants having been burnt down and plundered, exactions and heavy presents extorted under the threat of stopping the trade, and the governor, when applied to, alleging it to be out of his jurisdiction to interfere.

CAPE OF GOOD HOPE.

SIR ANDRIES STOCKENSTROM.—"Our readers will have observed from our last, that the queen has bestowed a baronetcy on our late Lieutenant-Governor,

vernor, Captain Stockenstrom. This is some atonement to the outraged justice of his case, and to the outraged feelings of all who labour and long for the advancement of the native-born of this colony. But we take this as only the first step in retrieving the error into which Lord Normanby was led, and of the discredit of which all the cabinet are partakers. Is it so that talent, and independence of spirit, and long experience, are so abundant, so much within the call of the present ministry, that they can with indifference lay aside such a man as Stockenstrom, in the vigour of his age, and at the moment when the active services of such men were most emphatically demanded by the circumstances of the colony? Would it were so! But they know and feel that it is far otherwise. At least if they are ignorant of the fact, they stand alone in their ignorance. But as we have said, we regard this only as a first step, and we congratulate them on the first favourable symptom of recovery from a very dangerous delusion."—South African Advertiser.

Home News.

SIR ALEXANDER JOHNSTON.—We have just heard with much pleasure that the French government—entertaining the highest respect for the well-earned reputation and great talents of Sir Alexander Johnston, of Carnsalloch, and appreciating warmly his successful exertions for many years to abolish the slave-trade in every part of the British dominions, and more particularly in Ceylon—have, in the most flattering manner, communicated to the right honorable gentleman their wish that he should permit himself to be enrolled a vice-president of the society recently established in France for the purpose of putting an end to slavery, in whatever form it may exist, throughout the French dominions. We feel sure that the great practical experience of Sir Alexander Johnston will be most invaluable in pointing out to the French Cabinet the best means of ensuring the object which they have in view; and it must be exceedingly gratifying to those who are acquainted with Sir Alexander to know that so high and just a compliment has been paid to one, who, through a long and useful public life, has been the indefatigable promoter of the enlightened views of Clarkson, Wilberforce, and Buxton, names never to be mentioned without veneration.—*Dumfries Courier.*

PAUL CUFFE.—We have received a very pretty little book, entitled *Memoir of Paul Cuffe*, a man of colour. Its design is to show (what it is really a disgrace to humanity that any body should now need to be convinced of) that men of one colour may be as sagacious, as persevering, as benevolent, and in all respects as eminent as those of another. Paul Cuffe was really a most delightful man, and every person who wants to know whether qualities of the first class may be found under a black skin would do well to read this very pretty account of his life.

MR. HAYDON'S PAINTING OF THE GENERAL ANTI-SLAVERY CONVENTION.—It is stated in an American paper that the size of this picture is to be ten feet by seven. On the contrary, it will be 13 feet by 10. It is making most satisfactory progress.

MR. TURNBULL has been gazetted as Superintendent of Liberated Africans at Havana.

Anti-Slavery Reporter.

LONDON, SEPTEMBER 23RD.

ON the 26th of August, a meeting of the Belfast anti-slavery society was held in the school-room, Fisherwick Place, Professor Stevely in the chair. This meeting was called to give Captain Stuart an opportunity of stating such facts as had come under his observation during his recent visit to the West Indies. The speech of our excellent friend occupied nearly three hours in the delivery. In answer to a question by the Rev. Dr. Bryce, whether the reports that were seen in some of the newspapers, stating that the laws in the colonies were bad, were correct, the captain is reported to have replied that "he did not think the laws were bad." This is no doubt an error of the press. Besides Dr. Bryce, the following gentlemen took part in the proceedings: the Rev. Messrs. Morgan, Hamilton, M'Illwaine, and Mr. Stanfield. The last named gentleman intimated a desire to know whether the general assembly of the Presbyterian church, which had lately met in Belfast, had availed themselves of the opportunity, in replying to the communication from the Presbyterian church in America, to denounce the crime of slavery, with which that religious body were deeply contaminated.

The other home operations undertaken since our last, are narrated in the following letter from Mr. Scoble.

London, 22nd September, 1840.

MY DEAR FRIEND.—Agreeably to the arrangements made previously to my leaving town, I proceeded to Chelmsford on Tuesday, the 9th instant, and in company with my excellent friend, Mr. Stanton, held an anti-slavery meeting in the shire hall on the evening of that day. The reverend Mr. Gray was in the chair, and our zealous friend, Joseph Marriage, Junior, Esq., as usual, rendered us most effective assistance. The meeting at first was small, but the place soon became full, and great interest was excited by the powerful address of my companion. On Wednesday we proceeded to Colchester, where we were most kindly received and entertained by Thomas Catchpool, Esq., who, in conjunction with our old and tried friend, Mr. William Cross, had taken measures to secure us a good meeting in the evening. The Friends' Meeting house was lent for the occasion, and Mr. Francis, a solicitor, took the chair. The statements made on the subject of American slavery, and on the duties which devolve on British abolitionists, were received with the deepest attention, and were heartily responded to. The house was full, probably a larger anti-slavery meeting was never held in that town. On Thursday evening we were at Ipswich, and held our meeting in the new

and commodious temperance hall in that town, our venerable friend Thomas Clarkson, Esq., in the chair. On our arrival at the hall we found it already nearly full, and shortly after the commencement of the proceedings it became crowded. To the astonishment of not a few, Mr. Clarkson spoke for a period of about twenty minutes, during which he gave a most graphic and touching description of the miserable condition of the slave, which I trust will be fully reported, as it cannot fail to reach the heart of every humane person. He was able to remain until nearly the close of Mr. Stanton's speech, which was a very powerful one, and which drew from the audience alternately tears, and bursts of indignation. I confined myself to the results of emancipation and the general question, which appeared to give much satisfaction to the meeting. On Friday we paid a visit, by request, to Mr. Clarkson, at Playford Hall, where we spent several hours in conversation with him on anti-slavery subjects, and were both gratified and surprised at the amazing vigour of his intellect, the extraordinary retentiveness of his memory, and the freshness of his feelings. It was truly delightful to find that he has not materially suffered from his recent very great exertions.

On Saturday we left Ipswich for St. Ives, Huntingdonshire, which we reached late at night. The refreshment of the Sabbath in some measure prepared us for the meeting which was held on Monday evening. Our old and tried friend, George Day, Esq. was in the chair. I think I am correct in saying it was the largest, and I trust it will prove the most influential meeting of the kind ever held in the town. On the following day we proceeded to Boston in Lincolnshire, in the expectation of holding a meeting there the following evening, but owing to the evening being preoccupied by the Wesleyans, we were obliged to defer it until some future opportunity. On Thursday, I returned to town exceedingly unwell from a severe cold in my chest, which confined me to my bed on Wednesday, and Mr. Stanton proceeded to Lincoln and Gainsborough to hold meetings at these places, a report of which no doubt he will forward to you.

I am, my dear friend, yours very truly,
J. H. Tredgold, Esq.
JOHN SCOBLE.

WE learn with pleasure, that in the case of the reverend Samuel Oughton, the attorney-general of Jamaica has acted with much kindness. Not only has he afforded this persecuted minister of the gospel many consultations without taking a fee, but he also accompanied him to the judge's chambers when Mr. Oughton went to give bail, defended his cause, and offered to become bail for him to the amount of £500. and he would accept no remuneration for his services on this occasion. Mr. O'Reilly may be assured that many besides the immediate object of it will hold his kindness in high estimation. We add to this statement a short extract of a letter from Mr. Oughton, describing the feelings of his congregation on his liberation.

My poor dear people were almost mad with joy at my deliverance—they assembled in crowds around the judge's house, and lined the streets—indeed I was almost overcome with their simple but ardent expressions of delight and affection.

"FACTS," says the proverb, "are stubborn things," and certainly they are stubbornly adverse to the planters of British Guiana. They will have it that that magnificent colony is going to ruin—that sugar estates are worth nothing, &c. &c. &c. As if to confirm their complainings, two large estates of this class, are announced to be sold by public auction—this is the *proof of it*—ruin! ruin! Alas! for these lugubrious gentlemen, these estates have sold at high prices! So says the following extract of a letter dated Demerara, August 1st, 1840.

"Yesterday, at public vendue on twelve months' credit, plantation Montrose and plantation Ogle, on the east sea coast of Demerara, were sold, the former to Sir Michael M'Turk, for £38,000, and the latter to the house of George Anderson and Co., for £26,500. These are very large prices, as large if not larger than could have been obtained ten years ago, and prove that the resident planters and merchants do not really consider emancipation to have ruined their properties in this colony, however much they may find it politic to pretend that this is the case. Mr. Retemeyer, attorney of plantation Herstelling, has issued an address to the labourers of the estate of which he had the sole and uninterrupted charge for the last twenty years, in which he tells them that he is perfectly satisfied with their conduct. His crops are as large on an average as they were in the days of slavery. Our bank divided at the rate of eight per cent per annum at the last dividend, and there is a large surplus fund."

A pamphlet has just issued from the press, entitled *American Churches the Bulwark of American Slavery*, by our now well known and highly esteemed friend, Mr. Birney. The matter is so important, and a prompt and extensive circulation of it so desirable, that we have inserted the whole of it in our impression of this day.

We have inserted to-day the text of the obnoxious marriage act in Jamaica, by which our readers may form their own judgment of it. Besides the unjust and invidious enactments which we have already noticed, another is pointed out in the following extract of a letter from a missionary in that island, even in that clause which professes to legalize—what however are already legal without it—the antecedent marriages performed by dissenters. Thus writes our correspondent:

To render valid our past marriages we must record the whole by the 11th



of October. This will involve us in an expense of 1s. 8d. stamp for each marriage, and 2s. 6d. recording; i.e. 4s. 2d. each marriage. Now I suppose that I have about 2000 marriages to record, for which I never received one penny, and yet to record the same I must pay the sum of £413. currency, or the marriages are invalid, and the families of 2000 marriages pronounced illegitimate! Are these things to be so?

If this is the case with a single missionary, what must be the tax thus levied upon the whole? Certain legislators indeed, are reported to have said on this occasion, with much glee, "If we give them their right, we will make them pay for it." We opine, nevertheless, that the missionaries will not pay for it, and that they will have their right without money. As we have said, these marriages are legal already, and neither this nor any other act can render them otherwise.

AMERICAN CHURCHES THE BULWARKS OF AMERICAN SLAVERY.

The extent to which most of the churches in America are involved in the guilt of supporting the slave-system is known to but few in this country. So far from being even suspected by the great mass of the religious community here, it would not be believed but on the most indisputable evidence. Evidence of this character it is now proposed to present—applying to the Methodist Episcopal, the Baptist, the Presbyterian, and the Protestant Episcopal churches. It is done with a single view to make the British Christian public acquainted with the real state of the case—in order that it may, in the most intelligent manner possible, exert whatever influence it possesses with the American churches to persuade them to purify themselves from a sin that is fast bringing them under its dominion, and that threatens in the end wholly to destroy them.

The following *memoranda* will assist English readers in more readily apprehending the force and scope of the evidence.

I. Of the twenty-six American states, thirteen are slave states. Of the latter, Maryland, Virginia, Kentucky, Missouri, and Tennessee (in part,) are slave-selling states; the states south of them are slave-buying and slave-consuming states.

II. Between the slave-selling and slave-buying states, the slave-trade is carried on extensively and systematically. The slave-trader, on completing his purchases for a single adventure, brings the gang together at a convenient point; confines the men in double rows to a large chain running between the rows, by means of smaller lateral chains tightly riveted around the wrists of the slaves, and connected with the principal chain. They are in this way driven along the highways, (the small boys, the women, and girls following) without any release from their chains till they arrive at their ultimate place of sale. Here they occupy barracoons till they are disposed of one by one, or in lots, to those who will give most for them.

III. Ministers and office-bearers, and members of churches are slave-holders—buying and selling slaves, (not as the regular slave-trader) but as their convenience or interest may from time to time require. As a general rule, the itinerant preachers in the Methodist church are not permitted to hold slaves—but there are frequent exceptions.

IV. There are, in the United States, about 2,700,000 slaves, and 400,000 *free people of colour*. Of the slaves, 80,000 are members of the Methodist church; 80,000 of the Baptist; and about 40,000 of other churches. These church members have no exemption from being sold just as other slaves are. Instances occur in which slaveholding members of churches sell slaves who are members of the same church with themselves. And members of churches have been slave-auctioneers.

V. In most of the slave states the master is not permitted formally to emancipate, unless the emancipated person be removed from the state, (which makes the formal act unnecessary) or, unless by a special act of the legislature. If, however, he disregard the law and permit the slave to go at liberty and "do" for himself, the law—on the theory, that every slave ought to have a master to *see to him*—directs him to be sold for the benefit of the state. Instances of this, however, must be very rare. The people are better than their laws—for the writer, during a residence of more than thirty years in the slave states, never knew an instance of such a sale, nor has he ever heard of one that was fully authenticated.

VI. There is no law in any of the slave states forbidding the slaveholder to remove his slaves to a free state; nor against his giving the slaves themselves a "pass" for that purpose. The laws of some of the free states present obstructions to the settlement of coloured persons within their limits—but these obstructions are not insurmountable, and if the validity of the laws should be tried in the tribunals it would be found they are unconstitutional.

VII. In the slave-states a slave cannot be a witness in any case, civil or criminal, in which a white is a party. Neither can a free-coloured person, except in Louisiana. Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, (free states) make coloured persons incompetent as witnesses in any case in which a white is a party. In Ohio, a white person can prove his own ("book") account not exceeding a certain sum, by his own oath or affirmation. A coloured person cannot, as against a white. In Ohio the laws regard all who are mulattoes, or above the grade of mulattoes, as *white*.

VIII. There is no law in the slave states, forbidding the several church authorities making slaveholding an offence, for which those guilty of it might be excluded from membership.

The Society of Friends exists in the slave-states—it excludes slaveholders.

The United Brethren exist as a church in Maryland and Virginia, slave states. Their annual conference for these two states (in which are thirty preachers) met in February last.

The following is an extract from its minutes:—

"No charge is preferred against any (preachers,) except Franklin Echard and Moses Michael."

"It appeared in evidence that Moses Michael was the owner of a female slave, which is contrary to the discipline of our church. Conference therefore resolved, that unless brother Michael manumit or set free such slave in six months, he no longer be considered a member of our church."

IX. When ecclesiastical councils excuse themselves from acting for the removal of slavery from their respective communions, by saying, they cannot *legislate* for the abolition of slavery; that slavery is a *civil or political*

institution—that it "belongs to Caesar," and not to the church to put an end to it, they shun the point at issue. To the church member who is a debauchee, a drunkard, a seducer, a murderer, they find no difficulty in saying, "we cannot indeed proceed against your person, or your property—this belongs to Caesar,—to the tribunals of the country—to the legislature, but we can purify the church, and act with a view to your repentance, by separating you from its communion." If one white member should by force or intimidation deprive, day after day, another white member of his property, the authorities of the churches would expel him from their body, should he refuse to make restitution or reparation; although it could not be *enforced* except through the tribunals, over which they have no control. Where then is the difficulty of saying to the slave-holder—"cease being a slave-holder and remain in the church, or continue a slave-holder and go out of it: you have your choice."

X. The slave states make it penal, to teach the slaves to read. So also some of them, to teach the *free coloured people* to read. None of the slaveholding churches, or religious bodies, so far as is known, have, at any time, remonstrated with the legislatures against this iniquitous legislation, or petitioned for its repeal or modification. Nor have they reprobated or questioned such of their members, as, being also members of the legislatures, sanctioned such legislation by their votes.

XI. There is no systematic instruction of the slave-members of churches, either orally or in any other way.

XII. Uniting with a church makes no change in the condition of slaves *at home*. They are thrown back just as before, among their old associates, and subjected to their corrupting influences.

XIII. But little pains is taken to secure their attendance at public worship on Sundays.

XIV. The "house-servants" are rarely present at family-worship; the "field-hands," never.

XV. It is only one here and there that seems to have intelligent views of the nature of Christianity, or of a future life.

XVI. In the Methodist, Baptist, Presbyterian and Episcopal churches, the coloured people, during service, sit in a particular part of the house, now generally known as the *negro pew*. They are not permitted to sit in any other, nor to hire or purchase pews as other people, nor would they be permitted to sit, even if invited to do so, in the pews of white persons. This applies to all coloured persons, whether *members* or not, and even to *licensed ministers* of their respective connexions. The "*negro pew*" is almost as rigidly kept up in the free states as in the slave.

XVII.—In some of the older slave states, as Virginia, and South Carolina, churches, in their *corporate* character, hold slaves, who are generally hired out for the support of the minister. The following is taken from the Charleston Courier, of Feb. 12th, 1835.

FIELD NEGROS, by Thomas Gadsden.

On Tuesday, the 17th instant, will be sold at the north of the Exchange, at ten o'clock, a prime gang of ten NEGROS, accustomed to the culture of cotton and provisions, belonging to the INDEPENDENT CHURCH, in Christ's Church Parish. * * * * * Feb. 6.

XVIII.—Nor are instances wanting, in which negroes are *bequeathed* for the benefit of the Indians, as the following Chancery notice, taken from a Savannah (Geo.) paper, will show.

"Bryan Superior Court.

Between John J. Maxwell and others, Executors of Ann Pray, { complainants, and Mary Sleigh and others, Devisees and Legatees, under the will } IN EQUITY. of Ann Pray, defendants.

"A Bill, having been filed for the distribution of the estate of the Testatrix, Ann Pray, and it appearing that among other legacies in her will, is the following, viz. a legacy of one-fourth of certain negro slaves to the American Board of Commissioners for Domestic [Foreign it probably should have been] Missions for the purpose of sending the gospel to the heathen, and particularly to the Indians of this continent. It is on motion of the solicitors of the complainants ordered, that all persons claiming the said legacy, do appear and answer the bill of the complainants, within four months from this day. And it is ordered, that this order be published in a public Gazette of the city of Savannah, and in one of the Gazettes of Philadelphia, once a month for four months.

"Extract from the minutes, Dec. 2nd, 1832.

JOHN SMITH, C. S. C. B. C.—(The bequest was not accepted.)

INFLUENCES UNDER WHICH THE AMERICAN CHURCHES HAVE BEEN BROUGHT.
Charleston (City) Gazette.—"We protest against the assumption—the unwarrantable assumption—that slavery is ultimately to be extirpated from the southern states. Ultimate abolitionists are enemies of the south, the same in kind, and only less in degree, than immediate abolitionists."

Washington (City) Telegraph.—"As a man, a Christian, and a citizen, we believe that slavery is right; that the condition of the slaveholding states, is the best existing organization of civil society."

Chancellor Harper, of South Carolina.—"It is the order of nature and of GOD, that the being of superior faculties and knowledge, and therefore of superior power, should control and dispose of those who are inferior. It is as much in the order of nature, that men should enslave each other, as that other animals should prey upon each other."

Columbia (S. C.) Telescope.—"Let us declare, through the public journals of our country, that the question of slavery is not, and shall not be open to discussion—that the system is deep-rooted among us, and must remain for ever; that the very moment any private individual attempts to lecture upon its evils and immorality, and the necessity of putting means in operation to secure us from them, in the same moment his tongue shall be cut out and cast upon a dunghill."

Augusta (Geo.) Chronicle.—"He [Amos Dresser] should have been hung up as high as Haman, to rot upon the gibbet, until the wind whistled through his bones. The cry of the whole south should be death, INSTANT DEATH, to the abolitionist, wherever he is caught."

[Amos Dresser, now a missionary in Jamaica, was a theological student at Lane Seminary, near Cincinnati. In the vacation (August 1835) he undertook to sell books in the state of Tennessee, with the view to raise means further to continue his studies. Whilst there, he fell under suspicion of being an abolitionist, was arrested by the vigilance committee, whilst attending a religious meeting in the neighbourhood of Nashville, the capital of the state, and after an afternoon and evening's inquisition condemned to receive twenty lashes on his naked body. The sentence was executed on him, between eleven and twelve o'clock on Saturday night]

in the presence of most of the committee, and of an infuriated and blaspheming mob. The vigilance committee (an unlawful association) consisted of sixty persons. Of these, twenty-seven were members of churches; one, a religious teacher, another, the *Elder*, who but a few days before, in the Presbyterian church handed Mr. Dresser the bread and wine at the communion of the Lord's Supper.]

In the latter part of the summer of 1835, the slave-holders became greatly alarmed at the progress of the principles of the abolitionists. Meetings were held by them throughout the south, in order to excite all classes of people to the requisite degree of exasperation against the abolitionists. At one of these meetings, held at Clinton, Mississippi, it was

Resolved.—"That slavery through the south and west is not felt as an evil, moral or political, but it is recognized in reference to the *actual*, and not to any Utopian condition of our slaves, as a blessing both to master and slave."

2.—"That it is our decided opinion, that any individual who dares to circulate, with a view to effectuate the designs of the abolitionists, any of the incendiary tracts or newspapers now in a course of transmission to this country, is justly worthy in the sight of God and man of immediate death; and we doubt not, that such would be the punishment of any offender in any part of the State of Mississippi where he may be found."

3.—"That we recommend to the citizens of Mississippi to encourage the cause of the American colonization society, so long as in good faith it concentrates its energies alone on the removal of the free people of colour out of the United States."

4.—"That the clergy of the State of Mississippi be hereby recommended at once to take a stand upon this subject, and that their further silence in relation thereto, at this crisis, will in our opinion be subject to serious censure."

At Charleston, South Carolina, the post office was forced, the anti-slavery publications, which were there for distribution or further transmission to *masters*, taken out and made a bon-fire of in the street, by a mob of several thousand people.

A public meeting was appointed to be held a few days afterward, to complete, in the same spirit in which they were commenced, preparations for excluding anti-slavery publications from circulation, and for ferreting out persons suspected of favouring the doctrines of the abolitionist that they might be subjected to Lynch law. At this assembly the *Charleston Courier* informs us;

"The clergy of all denominations attended in a body lending their sanction to the proceedings, and adding by their presence to the impressive character of the scene."

It was there resolved,—"That the thanks of this meeting are due to the reverend gentlemen of the clergy in this city who have so promptly and so effectually responded to public sentiment, by suspending their schools in which the *free coloured population* were taught; and that this meeting deem it a patriotic action worthy of all praise, and proper to be imitated by other teachers of similar schools throughout the State."

The alarm of the Virginia slave-holders was not less—nor were the clergy in the city of Richmond, the capital, less prompt than the clergy in Charleston, to respond to "public sentiment." Accordingly on the 29th July, they assembled together, and

Resolved, unanimously.—"That we earnestly deprecate the unwarrantable and highly improper interference of the people of any other State with the domestic relations of master and slave."

"That the example of our Lord Jesus Christ and his apostles, in not interfering with the question of slavery, but uniformly recognizing the relations of master and servant, and giving full and affectionate instruction to both is worthy of the imitation of all ministers of the gospel."

"That we will not patronize nor receive any pamphlet or newspaper of the anti-slavery societies, and that we will discountenance the circulation of all such papers in the community."

"That the suspicions which have prevailed to a considerable extent against ministers of the gospel and professors of religion in the State of Virginia, as identified with abolitionists are *wholly unmerited*—believing as we do, from extensive acquaintance with our churches and brethren, that they are unanimous in opposing the pernicious scheme of abolitionists."

THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

(700,000 Members.)

In 1780, four years before the Episcopal Methodist church was regularly organized in the United States, the conference bore the following testimony against slavery:—

"The conference acknowledges that slavery is contrary to the laws of God, man, and nature, and hurtful to society; contrary to the dictates of conscience and true religion; and doing what we would not others should do unto us."

In 1784, when the church was fully organized, rules were adopted, prescribing the times at which members who were already slave-holders, should emancipate their slaves. These rules were succeeded by the following:—

"Every person concerned, who will not comply with these rules, shall have liberty quietly to withdraw from our society within the twelve months following, the notice being given him as aforesaid; otherwise the assistants shall exclude him the society."

"No person holding slaves shall in future be admitted into society, or to the Lord's Supper, till he previously comply with these rules concerning slavery."

"Those who buy, or sell, or give [slaves] away, unless on purpose to free them, shall be expelled immediately."

"In 1785, the following language was held:—

"We do hold in the deepest abhorrence the practice of slavery, and shall not cease to seek its destruction by all wise and prudent means."

In 1801:—

"We declare that we are more than ever convinced of the great evil of African slavery, which still exists in these United States."

"Every member of the society who sells a slave shall, immediately after full proof, be excluded from the society," &c.

"The annual conferences are directed to draw up addresses for the gradual emancipation of the slaves to the legislature."—"Proper committees shall be appointed by the annual conferences, out of the most respectable of our friends, for the conducting of the business; and the

presiding elders, elders, deacons, and travelling preachers, shall procure as many proper signatures as possible to the addresses; and give all the assistance in their power, in every respect to aid the committees and to further the blessed undertaking. Let this be continued from year to year till the desired end be accomplished."

1836. The general conference met in May, in Cincinnati, a town of 48,000 inhabitants, and the metropolis of the free state of Ohio. An Anti-slavery Society had been formed there a year or two before. A meeting of the society was appointed for the evening of the 10th of May, to which the abolition delegates attending the conference were invited.* Of those who attended, two of them made remarks appropriate to the occasion. On the 12th of May, Rev. S. G. Roszell presented in the conference the following preamble and resolutions:—

"Whereas, great excitement has pervaded this country on the subject of modern abolitionism, which is reported to have been increased in this city recently, by the unjustifiable conduct of two members of the general conference in lecturing upon, and in favour of that agitating topic;—and whereas, such a course on the part of any of its members is calculated to bring upon this body the suspicion and distrust of the community, and misrepresent its sentiments in regard to the point at issue;—and whereas, in this aspect of the case, a due regard for its own character, as well as a just concern for the interests of the church confided to its care, demand a full, decided, and unequivocal expression of the views of the general conference in the premises." Therefore,

1. *Resolved*.—"By the delegates of the annual conference in general conference assembled, that they disapprove in the most unqualified sense, the conduct of the two members of the general conference, who are reported to have lectured in this city recently, upon, and in favour of, modern abolitionism."

2. "By the delegates of the annual conferences in general conference assembled,—that they are decidedly opposed to modern abolitionism, and wholly disclaim any right, with, or intention, to interfere in the civil and political relation between master and slave, as it exists in the slave-holding states of this union."

The preamble and resolutions were adopted—the first resolution by 122 to 11—the last by 120 to 14.

An address was received from the Methodist Wesleyan conference in England, in which the anti-christian character of slavery, and the duty of the Methodist was plainly, yet tenderly and affectionately brought before it. The conference refused to publish it.

In the Pastoral Address to the churches, are these passages:—

"It cannot be unknown to you, that the question of slavery in the United States, by the constitutional compact which binds us together as a nation, is left to be regulated by the several state legislatures themselves; and thereby is put beyond the control of the general government, as well as that of all ecclesiastical bodies; it being manifest that in the slave-holding states themselves, the entire responsibility of its existence, or non-existence, rests with those state legislatures." * * * "These facts which are only mentioned here as a reason for the friendly admonition which we wish to give you, constrain us as your pastors, who are called to watch over your souls, as they must give account, to exhort you to abstain from all abolition movements and associations, and to refrain from patronizing any of their publications," &c. * *

"From every view of the subject which we have been able to take, and from the most calm and dispassionate survey of the whole ground, we have come to the only safe scriptural and prudent way for us, both as ministers and people to take, is, wholly to refrain from this agitating subject," &c.

The temper exhibited by the general conference, was warmly sympathized in by many of the local conferences, not only in the slave states but in the free.

The Ohio annual conference had a short time before,

1. *Resolved*.—"That we deeply regret the proceedings of the abolitionists, and anti-slavery societies in the free states, and the consequent excitement produced thereby in the slave states; that we, as a conference, disclaim all connexion and co-operation with, or belief in the same; and that we hereby recommend to our junior preachers, local brethren, and private members within our bounds, to abstain from any connexion with them, or participation of their acts in the premises whatever."

2. "That those brethren and citizens of the north, who resist the abolition movements with firmness and moderation, are the true friends to the church, to the slaves of the south, and to the constitution of our common country," &c.

The New York annual conference met in June, 1836, and

1. *Resolved*.—"That this conference fully concur in the advice of the late general conference, as expressed in their pastoral address."

2. "That we disapprove of the members of this conference patronizing, or in any way giving countenance to a paper called 'Zion's Watchman,' because in our opinion, it tends to disturb the peace and harmony of the body, by sowing dissensions in the church."

3. "That although we would not condemn any man, or withhold our suffrages from him on account of his *opinions* merely, in reference to the subject of abolitionism, yet we are decidedly of the opinion, that none ought to be elected to the office of deacon, or elder in our church, unless he give a pledge to the Conference, that he will refrain from agitating the church with discussions on this subject, and the more especially as the one promises, 'reverently to obey them to whom the charge and government over him is committed; following with a glad mind and will, their godly admonitions,' and the other with equal solemnity, promises to 'maintain and set forward, as much as lieth in him, quietness, peace, and love among all christian people, and especially among them that are, or shall be committed to his charge.'

In 1838, the same conference, resolved:—

"As the sense of this conference, that any of its members, or probationers, who shall patronize Zion's Watchman, either by writing in commendation of its character, by circulating it, recommending it to our people,

* The Rev. Mr. Lovejoy, who was afterwards slain by the mob in defending his press, at Alton, Illinois, was present at the meeting. He was on his way from St. Louis, where he then resided, to Pittsburg, to attend the general assembly of the presbyterian church.

+ Zion's Watchman is a newspaper devoted to the anti-slavery cause and the religious interests of the Methodist Episcopal church. It is edited by the Rev. La Roy Sunderland, of that church.

or procuring subscribers, or by collecting or remitting monies, shall be deemed guilty of indiscretion, and dealt with accordingly."

The preachers—judging by the vote on the anti-abolition resolutions—were expected of course to conform to the advice in the Pastoral address. The New York conference—the most influential—set the example of exacting a pledge from the candidates for orders, that they would not agitate the subject of slavery in their congregations. The official newspapers of the connexion, would of course be silent. Therefore, as a measure for wholly excluding the slavery question from the church, it was of the last importance that Zion's Watchman, an unofficial paper, and earnest in the cause, should be prevented from circulating among the members.

Having seen in what spirit the conferences of the free states were willing to act, we will now see what was the temper of the conferences in the slave states. They were not under the same necessity as the free state conferences, of guarding against agitation, by the young men who would apply for orders—for in the slave states, they were comparatively few, and being brought up under the influence of slavery, were considered sound on that subject. The point of most interest to the slave-holding professors of religion was, to *steal their own consciences*.

The Baltimore Conference resolved:—"That in all cases of administration under the general rule in reference to buying and [or] selling men, women, and children, &c. it be, and hereby is recommended to all committees, as the sense and opinion of this conference, that the said rule be taken, construed, and understood, so as not to make the guilt or innocence of the accused to depend upon the simple fact of purchase or sale of any such slave or slaves, but upon the attendant circumstances of cruelty, injustice, or inhumanity, on the one hand, or those of kind purposes, or good intentions on the other, under which, the transactions shall have been perpetrated; and farther, it is recommended that in all such cases, the charge be brought for immorality, and the circumstances adduced as specifications under that charge."

THE GEORGIA ANNUAL CONFERENCE,

Resolved unanimously that:—"Whereas, there is a clause in the discipline of our church, which states, that we are as much as ever convinced of the great evil of slavery; and whereas the said clause has been perverted by some, and used in such a manner as to produce the impression that the Methodist Episcopal church believed slavery to be a moral evil."

Therefore resolved,—"That it is the sense of the Georgia annual conference, that slavery as it exists in the United States, is not a moral evil."

Resolved,—"That we view slavery as a civil and domestic institution, and one with which, as ministers of Christ, we have nothing to do, further than to ameliorate the condition of the slave, by endeavouring to impart to him and his master the benign influences of the religion of Christ, and aiding both on their way to heaven."

On the motion, it was resolved unanimously,—"That the Georgia annual conference regard with feelings of profound respect and approbation, the dignified course pursued by our several superintendents or bishops in suppressing the attempts that have been made by various individuals to get up and protract an excitement in the churches and country on the subject of abolitionism."

Resolved, further,—"That they shall have our cordial and zealous support in sustaining them in the ground they have taken."

SOUTH CAROLINA CONFERENCE.

The Rev. W. Martin, introduced resolutions, similar to those of the Georgia conference.

The Rev. W. Capers, D.D., after expressing his conviction that "the sentiment of the resolutions was universally held, not only by the ministers of that conference, but of the whole south," and after stating, that "the only true doctrine was, 'it belongs to Caesar, and not to the church,'" offered the following as a substitute:

"Whereas, we hold that the subject of slavery in these United States is not one proper for the action of the church, but is exclusively appropriate to the civil authorities,

Therefore, Resolved,—"That this conference will not intermeddle with it, farther than to express our regret that it has ever been introduced, in any form, into any one of the judicatures of the church.

"Brother Martin accepted the substitute.

"Brother Betts asked, whether the substitute was intended as implying that slavery, as it exists among us, was not a moral evil? He understood it as equivalent to such a declaration.

"Brother Capers explained, that his intention was to convey that sentiment fully and unequivocally; and that he had chosen the form of the substitute for the purpose, not only of reproving some wrong doings at the north, but with reference also to the general conference. If slavery were a moral evil (that is sinful), the church would be bound to take cognizance of it; but our affirmation is, that it is not a matter for her jurisdiction, but is exclusively appropriate to the civil government, and of course not sinful.

"The substitute was then unanimously adopted.

"On motion of brother N. Tally, the second Fridays in April and September were appointed to be observed as days of fasting and prayer."

SENTIMENTS OF NON-SLAVE-HOLDING METHODIST MINISTERS.

Rev. N. Bangs, D.D., of New York:

"It appears evident, that however much the apostles might have deprecated SLAVERY as it then existed throughout the Roman empire, he did not feel it his duty, as an ambassador of Christ, to disturb those relations which subsisted between master and servants, by denouncing slavery as such a mortal sin, that they could not be servants of Christ in such a relation."

Rev. E. D. Simms, Professor in Randolph, Macon College, a Methodist Institution:

"These extracts from HOLY WRIT UNEQUIVOCALLY ASSERT THE RIGHT OF PROPERTY IN SLAVES, together with the usual incidents of that right; such as the power of acquisition and disposition in various ways, according to municipal regulations. The right to buy and sell, and to transmit to children by way of inheritance, is clearly stated. The only restriction on the subject, is in reference to the market, in which slaves or bondsmen were to be purchased.

"Upon the whole, then, whether we consult the Jewish polity instituted by God himself; or the uniform opinion and practice of mankind in all ages of the world; or the injunctions of the New Testament and the Moral law; we are brought to the conclusion, that slavery is not immoral.

"Having established the point, that the first African slaves were

legally brought into bondage, the right to detain their children in bondage, follows as an indispensable consequence.

"Thus we see that the slavery which exists in America, was founded in right."

The Rev. Wilbur Fisk, D.D., late President of the [Methodist] Wesleyan University in Connecticut:

"The relation of master and slave, may, and does in many cases, exist under such circumstances, as to free the master from the just charge and guilt of immorality."

"1 Cor. vii. 20—23.

"This text seems mainly to enjoin and sanction the fitting continuance of their present social relations; the freeman was to remain free, and the slave, unless emancipation should offer, was to remain a slave."

"The general rule of christianity not only permits, but in supposable circumstances, enjoins a continuance of the master's authority."

"The New Testament enjoins obedience upon the slave as an obligation due to a present rightful authority."

Rev. Elijah Hedding, D.D., one of the six Methodist Bishops:

"The right to hold a slave is founded on this rule, 'Therefore, all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them; for this is the law and the prophets.'—Ch. Ad. and Journal, Oct. 20, 1837.

SENTIMENTS OF SLAVE-HOLDING METHODIST MINISTERS.

The Rev. William Winans, of Mississippi, in the general conference, in 1836:

"He was not born in a slave state—he was a Pennsylvanian by birth. He had been brought up to believe a slave-holder as great a villain as a horse-thief; but he had gone to the south, and long residence there had changed his views; he had become a slave-holder on principle." * * *

"Though a slave-holder himself, no abolitionist felt more sympathy for the slave than he did—none had rejoiced more in the hope of a coming period, when the print of a slave's foot would not be seen on the soil." *

* * * "It was important to the interests of slaves, and in view of the question of slavery, that there be christians who were slave-holders. Christian ministers should be slave-holders, and diffused throughout the south. Yes, sir, Presbyterians, Baptists, Methodists, should be slave-holders; yes,—he repeated it boldly—there should be members, and deacons, and ELTERS, and BISHOPS, too, who were slave-holders."

The Rev. J. Early, of Virginia, on the same occasion:

"Sir,—We have no energy. But if a majority of this conference have no energy—not enough of it, to protect their own honour from insult and degradation—be it known, that there are in the conference those who have—AND WHO OUGHT TO BE BY THEMSELVES. It is full time, for you, sir, to speak out—to testify that you have some regard for yourselves—to say that you have some regard for your honour. Submit to this, sir! If we submit to this, we are prepared to submit to anything."

The Rev. J. H. Thornwell, at a public meeting held in South Carolina, supported the following resolutions:

"That slavery as it exists in the south is no evil, and is consistent with the principles of revealed religion; and that all opposition to it arises from a misguided and fiendish fanaticism, which we are bound to resist in the very threshold."

"That all interference with this subject by fanatics, is a violation of our civil and social rights—is unchristian and inhumane leading necessarily to anarchy and bloodshed; and that the instigators are murderers and assassins."

"That any interference with this subject, on the part of Congress, must lead to a dissolution of the union."

The Rev. George W. Langhorne, of North Carolina, thus writes to the Editor of Zion's Watchman, under date, June 25th, 1836.

"I, sir, would as soon be found in the ranks of a banditti, as numbered with Arthur Tappan and his wanton co-adjutors. Nothing is more appalling to my feelings as a man, contrary to my principles as a christian, and repugnant to my soul as a minister, than the insidious proceedings of such men.

If you have not resigned your credentials as a minister of the Methodist Episcopal church, I really think that, as an honest man, you should now do it. In your ordination vows you solemnly promised to be obedient to those who have rule over you; and since they [the general conference] have spoken, and that distinctly, too, on this subject, and disapprove your conduct, I conceive you are bound to submit to their authority or leave the church."

The Rev. J. C. Postell, in July, 1836, delivered an address at a public meeting at Orangeburgh Court-house, S. C., in which he maintains:

1. That slavery is judicial visitation. 2. That it is not a moral evil.

3. That it is supported by the Bible. He thus argues his second point:

"It is not a moral evil. The fact that slavery is of Divine appointment, would be proof enough with the christian, that it could not be a moral evil. But when we view the hordes of savage marauders and human cannibals enslaved to lust and passion, and abandoned to idolatry and ignorance, to revolutionise them from such a state, and enslave them where they may have the gospel, and the privileges of christians; so far from being a moral evil, it is a merciful visitation. If slavery was either the invention of man or a moral evil, it is logical to conclude, the power to create has the power to destroy. Why then has it existed? And why does it now exist amidst all the power of legislation in state and church, and the clamour of abolitionists? It is the Lord's DOINGS AND MARVELLOUS IN OUR EYES: and had it not been done for the best, God alone, who is able long since, would have overruled it. It is BY DIVINE APPOINTMENT."

On that occasion the same rev. gentleman read a letter which he had addressed to the editor of Zion's Watchman—of which the following are extracts:

"To La Roy Sunderland, &c.

Did you calculate to misrepresent the Methodist discipline, and say it supported abolitionism, when the general conference, in their late resolutions, denounced it as a *libel on truth*? "Oh, full of all subtlety, thou child of the devil!!" "all liars, saith the sacred volume, shall have their part in the lake of fire and brimstone."

I can only give one reason why you have not been indicted for a libel—The law says, "The greater the truth, the greater the libel;" and as your paper has no such ingredient, it is construed but a small matter. But if you desire to educate the slaves, I will tell you how to raise the money without editing Zion's Watchman; you and old Arthur Tappan come out to the south this winter, and they will raise one hundred thousand dollars.

for you. New Orleans, itself, will be pledged for it. Desiring no further acquaintance with you, and never expecting to see you but once in time or eternity, that is at judgment, I subscribe myself, the friend of the Bible, and the opposer of the abolitionists.

J. C. POSTELL,
Orangeburgh, July 21st, 1836.

THE GENERAL CONFERENCE FOR 1840

Held its session in May, in Baltimore.

The Rev. Silas Comfort appealed from a decision of the Missouri conference, of which he was a member. That conference had convicted him of "mal-administration," in admitting the testimony of a coloured person in the trial of a white member of the church. The general conference reversed the decision of the Missouri conference. The southern delegates insisted on something being done, to counteract the injurious influence which the decision of the general conference would have on the Methodist church in the slave states.

The Rev. Dr. A. J. Few, of Georgia, proposed the following:—

Resolved,—“That it is inexpedient and unjustifiable for any preacher to permit coloured persons to give testimony against white persons, in any state where they are denied that privilege by law.”

This was carried. It was inconsistent with the decision in Comfort's case. What was to be done? The conference was getting into increasing perplexity. It would be best if it could be done, to rid itself of the whole subject. A motion was made to reconsider the decision in Comfort's case, with a view, if it should be carried, to move, *not to entertain his appeal*. Should this latter prevail, a motion could then be made to reconsider Dr. Few's resolution. If this should be carried, by another motion it could be laid on the table, and kept there. In this way the whole matter might be excluded.

The motion to reconsider the Comfort case was carried. So was the motion, *not to entertain* the appeal. But the motion to reconsider Dr. Few's resolution failed. Pending the debate, the southern delegates became alarmed, lest it would prevail.

In order to soothe the northern delegates, the following substitute was offered by the Rev. William A. Smith, of Virginia. [The same who in the general conference of 1836, publicly wished the Rev. Orange Scott, a leading abolitionist—also of the general conference—“in heaven.”]

Resolved,—“That the resolution offered by A. J. Few, and adopted on Monday the 18th instant, relating to the testimony of persons of colour, be reconsidered and amended so as to read as follows, viz.—“That it is *inexpedient and unjustifiable for any preacher among us to admit of persons of colour to give testimony on the trial of white persons in any slave-holding state where they are denied that privilege in trials at law*: Provided, that when an annual conference in any such state or territory shall judge it expedient to admit of the introduction of such testimony within its bounds, it shall be allowed so to do.”

However, the southern delegates were unanimous, (with a single exception) and the substitute was lost by an even vote.

The efforts made to “harmonize” the slave-holding and the non-slave-holding delegates, had thus far failed. It was not, however, abandoned. With that view, Bishop Soule, acting as the representative of the other Bishops, introduced three resolutions. We have not been able to procure a copy of them. In Zion's Watchman, we find them substantially stated thus:—

1. “The action of the general conference in the Comfort case was not intended to express or imply, that it was either expedient or justifiable to admit the testimony of coloured persons in states, where such testimony is rejected by the civil authorities.

2. “It was not intended by the adoption of Dr. Few's resolution, to prohibit the admission of it, when the civil authorities or usage authorizes its admission.

3. “Expresses the undiminished regard of the general conference for the coloured population.”

Immediately on the passage of Dr. Few's resolution, the “official members (forty-six in number) of the Sharp Street and Asbury Coloured Methodist Episcopal Church in Baltimore,” protested and petitioned against it. The following passages are in their address:—

“The adoption of such a resolution, by our highest ecclesiastical judiciary—a judiciary composed of the most experienced, and the wisest brethren in the church, the choice selection of twenty-eight annual conferences, has inflicted, we fear, an irreparable injury upon eighty thousand souls for whom Christ died—souls, who by this act of your body, have been strip of the dignity of christians, degraded in the scale of humanity, and treated as criminals, for no other reason than the colour of their skin! Your resolution has, in our humble opinion, *virtually* declared, that a mere physical peculiarity, the handwork of our all-wise and benevolent Creator, is *prima facie* evidence of incompetency to tell the truth, or is an unerring indication of unworthiness to bear testimony against a fellow-being, whose skin is denominated white.” **

“Brethren, out of the abundance of the heart we have spoken. *Our grievance is before you!* If you have any regard for the salvation of the eighty thousand immortal souls committed to your care; if you would not thrust beyond the pale of the church, *twenty-five hundred souls in this city* who have felt determined never to leave the church that has nourished and brought them up; if you regard us as children of one common Father—and can, upon reflection, sympathize with us as members of the body of Christ—if you would not incur the fearful, the tremendous responsibility of offending not only one, but many thousands of his ‘little ones’; we conjure you to wipe from your journal, the odious resolution which is ruining our people.”

“A Coloured Baltimorean,” writing to the Editor of Zion's Watchman, says:—

“The address was presented to one of the secretaries, a delegate of the Baltimore conference, and subsequently given by him to the Bishops. How many of the members of the conference saw it, I know not. One thing is certain, it was not read to the conference.”

SENTIMENTS EXPRESSED DURING THE DEBATES.

Rev. W. Capers, D.D., of Charleston, South Carolina:—

“Valued the quotations which had been made from the early disciplines and minutes; there was no kind of property that he valued so high as the works which contained them; they were the monuments of that primitive Methodism which he loved.” * * He then read from the minutes of 1780, 84, and 85, and attempted to show, from the smallness of the church, and the little connexion that it had with slavery in 1780, that it adopted the language which was precisely consistent with its circumstances, and just

such language as he would adopt under similar circumstances; but in 1784 and 85, when the church had extended further and became more entangled with slavery, there was a corresponding faltering in the language of the church against it. But in 1800, the church fell into a great error on this subject—an error which he had no doubt those who were so unfortunate as to fall into, very deeply deplored. The conference authorized addresses to the legislatures, and memorials to be circulated by all our ministers, and instructed them to continue these measures from year to year, till slavery was abolished. He had no doubt, that the men engaged in this work were sincere and pious, but they soon perceived that it was a great error, and abandoned it.” * * He thanked the brother from Canada (Rev. Egerton Ryerson,) for the strong sympathy he had expressed for southern institutions.” * * Notwithstanding the representations, that a part of the discipline was a dead letter, in the south, yet, he assured them, that they received the whole of it—they were under the whole of it—acknowledged it all,—but, said he, you must take heed what discipline you make for us now; if the chapter on slavery had not long been in the discipline, you could not put it there now. I repeat, therefore, you must beware what laws you make for us! You may easily adopt such measures as will effectually hedge up our way, and make us slaves. We cannot be made slaves; beware, therefore, I say, what discipline you give us! Be cautious what burthens you impose upon us! We know what our work is,—it is to preach to and pray for the slaves.”

Rev. Mr. Crowder, of Virginia —

“In its civil aspect, neither the general government, or any other government, ecclesiastical or civil, either directly or indirectly, has a right to touch slavery.” In its ecclesiastical aspect—“we are bound by the twenty-third article of our religion, to submit to the civil regulations of the state under which we live.” In its moral aspect—“Slavery was not only countenanced, permitted, and regulated by the Bible, but it was positively *instituted by God HIMSELF*—he had in so many words ENJOINED it.”

The Rev. Joshua Soule, D.D., of Ohio, (one of the Bishops,) in advocating the reconsideration of the decision in Comfort's case, said:—

“It will be recollect my brethren, that the Missouri Conference fixed no censure—not a particle of censure upon the character of Silas Comfort; the law therefore would not justify an appeal to this body. If that unfortunate word ‘*mal-administration*,’ had not been used in connexion with the case, it would never have found its way here.” “I do not express merely my own opinion in this case; it is the united opinion of your superintendents (Bishops,) and it is by their request that I address you on this occasion.”

Rev. Mr. Peck, of New York, who moved the reconsideration of Dr. Few's resolution:—

“That resolution, said he, was introduced under peculiar circumstances, during considerable excitement, and he went for it as a peace-offering to the South, without sufficiently reflecting upon the precise import of its phraseology; but after a little deliberation, he was sorry; and he had been sorry but once, and that was all the time; he was convinced that, if that resolution remained upon the journal, it would be disastrous to the whole northern church.”

Rev. D. A. J. Few, of Georgia, the mover of the original resolution:—

“Look at it! What do you declare to us in taking this course? Why, simply, as much as to say, ‘we cannot sustain you in the condition which you cannot avoid!’ We cannot sustain you in the necessary conditions of slave-holding;—one of its necessary conditions being the rejection of negro testimony! If it is not sinful to hold slaves, under all circumstances, it is not sinful to hold them in the only condition, and under the only circumstances, which they can be held. The rejection of negro testimony is one of the necessary circumstances, under which slave-holding can exist: indeed, it is utterly impossible for it to exist without it; therefore it is not sinful to hold slaves in the condition, and under the circumstances which they are held at the south, inasmuch as they can be held under no other circumstances.” * * If you believe that slave-holding is necessarily sinful, come out with the abolitionists and honestly say so. If you believe that slave-holding is necessarily sinful, you believe we are necessarily sinners: and if so, come out and honestly declare it, *and let us leave you.* ” * * We want to know distinctly, precisely, and honestly, the position which you take. We cannot be tampered with by you any longer. We have had enough of it. We are tired of your sickly sympathies.” * * If you are not opposed to the principles which it involves, unite with us, *like honest men*, and go home and boldly meet the consequences. We say again, you are responsible for this state of things! for it is you who have driven us to the alarming point, where we find ourselves.” * * You have made that resolution absolutely necessary to the quiet of the south! But you now revoke that resolution! And, you pass the Rubicon! Let me be not misunderstood. I say, *you pass the Rubicon!* If you revoke, you revoke the principle which that resolution involves, and you array the whole south against you, *and we must separate!* If you accord to the principle which it involves, arising from the necessity of the case, stick by it, ‘though the heavens perish!’ But if you persist on reconsideration, I ask in what light will your course be regarded in the south? What will be the conclusion there, in reference to it? Why, that you cannot sustain us as long as we hold slaves! It will declare in the face of the sun, ‘we cannot sustain you, gentlemen, while you retain your slaves!’ Your opposition to the resolution is based upon your opposition to slavery; you cannot therefore maintain your consistency, unless you come out with the abolitionists, and condemn us at once and for ever; or else refuse to reconsider.”

The Rev. William Winans, of Mississippi: (the same who was a delegate to the general conference in 1836.)

“He was never more deeply impressed with the solemnity of his situation—the act of this afternoon will determine the fate of our beloved Zion! Will you meet us half-way? Have you the magnanimity to consent to a compromise? I pledge myself, in behalf of every southern man, that if you will affirm the decision in the case of Silas Comfort, we will give up the resolution; but if you refuse to affirm, and wrest from us that resolution, you stab us to the vitals! Repeal that resolution, and you pass the Rubicon! Dear as union is, sir, there are interests at stake in this question which are dearer than *union*! Do not regard us as threatening! But what will become of our beloved Methodism? The interests of Methodism, throughout the whole south, are at stake! We can, however, endure to see the houses of God forsaken, and our wide extended, and beautiful fields, which we have long been cultivating, laid waste and turned into a moral wilderness. But what is to become of the

poor slave? I entreat of you to pause! You effectually shut out the consolations and hopes of the gospel from hundreds and thousands of poor slaves? I call heaven to record against you this day, that if you repeal that resolution, you seal the damnation of thousands of souls! I beseech you as upon my knees not to do it."

The Rev. Mr. Collins, of —

"Admonished the conference, that the moment they rescinded that resolution, they passed the Rubicon. The fate of the connexion was sealed."

The Rev. William A. Smith, of Virginia,

"Agreed with the brother from Mississippi, that there were interests involved in this question dearer than UNION itself, however dear that might be. Southerners are not prepared to commit their interests, much less their consciences to the holy keeping of northern men. Conscience was involved in this matter, and they could not be coerced."

Rev. Nathan Bangs, D.D., of New York:

"We were on a snag, and he believed he could help us off. He perceived a way to get out of the difficulty, and proceeded to read three resolutions, one of which went to affirm the decision of the Missouri conference in the Comfort case. He concluded with a proposition to refer the whole case to a committee, to see if something could not be done to harmonize the conference."

Rev. P. P. Sandford, of —

"Brethren spoke as though there were no interests involved in this question but southern and western, but he could assure brethren of their entire mistake. The north and east were as deeply concerned in the issue of this question as the west and south. * * * He was surprised at the course of Dr. Bangs, who, when the Missouri case was pending, retired without the bar, and thus dodged the question; and when Dr. Few's resolution was passed, he sat still in his chair, and refused to do his duty, but now he comes forward with a series of resolutions entirely inconsistent with all the facts in the case, with the very benevolent intention to enlighten us on the subject!! But what does he say? Why he declares that he believes that this conference ought to affirm the decision of the Missouri conference in the case of Silas Comfort! And what was that decision? Why, that it is mal-administration to admit the testimony of a coloured man in the trial of a white man! So that Comfort was condemned, as appears from the journals of that conference, solely for admitting the testimony of a coloured man! And Dr. Bangs is the man who declares upon this floor, that that decision ought to be affirmed by this conference! He was perfectly astounded! Brethren, talk of compromise! Is there any compromise in this?"

Bishop Soule spoke in favour of the compromise resolutions of the Rev. Mr. Smith:—

"It was in view of the vast but jeopardized interests of our beloved Zion; with a view to promote the union of our extended ecclesiastical confederation, that he ventured to speak on the present occasion. He would lay one hand upon the north and east, and the other upon the south, and constrain them to harmonize. He had listened to the speeches of brethren, and he perceived that the waters were troubled, but he was not alarmed; our ship is not wrecked, and he had no doubt but that we should bring her safe through. * * * He had listened to the intimations of the possible necessity of adopting this measure, but brethren had approached so near together, that they only appeared to differ as to the modus operandi of doing the thing, which all seemed to agree should be done. He could not, therefore, believe that brethren were in earnest in intimating the probability of a division [of the church] on so trifling an occasion. He had heard the appeals from brethren of the south with unmixed sympathy, because he was acquainted with the south: he was familiar with the difficulties which brethren from that region struggled with. * * * We are in danger of forgetting, that men born in the south are much better qualified to judge of the bearing which particular measures will have upon that region, than those of the north can be. He thanked the brother from Georgia, (Dr. Few) for his kind allusion to him and regretted that he was understood to take ground against the Dr., for he agreed with him entirely. * * * The brethren from the south came forward with all that frankness which characterizes southern men; I say, with all that frankness which characterizes southern men, for this is a distinguishing trait in their character, and propose conciliatory plan, which he thought could not fail to harmonize the great majority: I say the great majority, for I despair of giving satisfaction to all. * * * He could not possibly see an objectionable feature in, or any unfavourable effect that would be likely to result from adopting them, either in the north or south. Does any one think that they may be disastrously used in the north, in favour of modern abolitionism? I neither see it nor fear it. Permit me to say to the members of this general conference, who are connected with the abolition movements, that the brethren at the south are better judges, circumstanced as they are, than you can possibly be, in regard to every thing connected with slavery. * * * Surveying the whole ground of this unfortunate affair, and where is the man who dare come to the conclusion, that sufficient reasons have been developed in this controversy for dividing the body of Christ?"

THE BAPTIST CHURCH.
(500,000 Members.)

In 1835 the Charleston Baptist Association addressed a memorial to the legislature of South Carolina, which contains the following:—

"The undersigned would further represent, that the said association does not consider that the holy scriptures have made the fact of slavery a question of morals at all. The Divine Author of our holy religion, in particular, found slavery a part of the existing institutions of society; with which, if not sinful, it was not his design to intermeddle, but to leave them entirely to the control of men. Adopting this, therefore, as one of the allowed arrangements of society, he made it the province of his religion only to prescribe the reciprocal duties of the relation. The question it is believed, is purely one of political economy. It amounts, in effect, to this—Whether the operatives of a country shall be bought and sold, and themselves become property, as in this state; or whether they shall be hirelings, and their labour only become property, as in some other states; in other words, whether an employer may buy the whole time of labourers at once, of those who have a right to dispose of it, with a permanent relation of protection and care over them, or, whether he shall be restricted to buy it in certain portions only, subject to their control, and with no such permanent relation of care and protection. The right of masters to dispose of the time of their slaves has been distinctly recognized by the Creator of all things, who is surely at liberty to vest the right

of property over any object in whomsoever he pleases. That the lawful possessor should retain this right at will, is no more against the laws of society and good morals than that he should retain the personal endowments with which his Creator has blessed him, or the money and lands inherited from his ancestors, or acquired by his industry. And neither society, nor individuals, have any more authority to demand a relinquishment, without an equivalent, in the one case, than in the other.

"As it is a question purely of political economy, and one which in this country is reserved to the cognizance of the state governments severally, it is further believed, that the state of South Carolina alone has the right to regulate the existence and condition of slavery within her territorial limits; and we should resist to the utmost every invasion of this right, come from what quarter and under whatever pretence it may."

In 1835, the following query, referring to slaves, was presented to the Savannah River Baptist Association of ministers:—

"Whether, in case of involuntary separation of such a character as to preclude all prospect of future intercourse, the parties ought to be allowed to marry again?"

Answer.—"That such separation among persons situated as our slaves are, is civilly a separation by death, and they believe, that, in the sight of God, it would be so viewed. To forbid second marriages in such cases, would be to expose the parties, not only to stronger hardships, and strong temptations, but to church censure, for acting in obedience to their masters, who cannot be expected to acquiesce in a regulation at variance with justice to the slaves and to the spirit of that command which regulates marriage among christians. The slaves are not free agents, and a dissolution by death is not more entirely without their consent, and beyond their control, than by such separation."

Sept. 1835. The ministers and messengers of the Goslien Association, assembled at Free Union, Virginia, state—"The most of us have been, born and brought up in the midst of this population. Very many of us, too, have been ushered into life under inauspicious circumstances, having no patrimonies to boast, and inheriting little else from our parents but an existence and a name. We have, however, through the blessing of God, by a persevering course of industry and rigid economy acquired a competent support for ourselves and families; and as a reward for our laborious exertion we received such property [slaves] as was guaranteed to us, not only by the laws of our individual states, but by those of the United States. In consideration whereof we unanimously adopt the following resolutions:—

1. "That we consider our right and title to this property altogether legal and bond fide, and that it is a breach of the faith pledged in the federal constitution, for our northern brethren to try, either directly or indirectly, to lessen the value of this property or impair our title thereto."

2. "That we view the torch of the incendiary, and the dagger of the midnight assassin, loosely concealed under the specious garb of humanity and religion falsely so called."

3. "That we consider there is something radically wrong in the logic of those would-be philanthropists at the north, who lay it down as one of their main propositions, that they must do what is right regardless of consequences, inasmuch as they will not venture to come, this side of the Potomac to teach and lecture publicly where (they say) this crying evil exists."

SENTIMENTS OF INDIVIDUAL BAPTISTS.

The late Rev. Lucius Bolles, D.D., of Massachusetts, Cor. Sec. Am. Bap. board for Foreign Missions:—

(1834) "There is a pleasing degree of union among the multiplying thousands of Baptists, throughout the land. * * * Our southern brethren are generally, both ministers and people, slave-holders."

Rev. R. Furman, D.D. of South Carolina.

"The right of holding slaves is clearly established in the Holy Scriptures, both by precept and example.—*Exposition of the views of the Baptists addressed to the Governor of S. Carolina, 1833.*

Dr. Furman died not long afterward. His legal representatives thus advertise his property for sale:—

"Notice.—On the first Monday of February next, will be put up at public auction, before the court house, the following property, belonging to the estate of the late Rev. Dr. Furman, viz.:—

"A plantation or tract of land on and in the Wataree Swamp. A tract of the first quality of fine land, on the waters of Black River. A lot of land in the town of Camden. A Library of a miscellaneous character, chiefly Theological. 27 NEGROES, some of them very prime. Two mules, one horse, and an old wagon."

THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH,

(350,000 Members.)

In 1793, the general assembly not very long after it was organised, adopted the "judgment" of the New York and Philadelphia synods, in favour of "Universal liberty." In 1794, it adopted the following as a note to the Eighth commandment, as expressing the doctrine of the church on slaveholding:—

"1 Tim. i. 10. The law is made for man-stealers. This crime among the Jews exposed the perpetrators of it to capital punishment: Exodus xxi. 15; and the apostle here classes them with sinners of the first rank. The word he uses, in its original import, comprehends all who are concerned in bringing any of the human race into slavery, or in retaining them in it. *Hominum fures, qui servos vel liberos abducunt, retinent, vendunt, vel emunt.*—Stealers of men are all those who bring off slaves or freemen, and keep, sell, or buy them. To steal a freeman, says Grotius, is the highest kind of theft. In other instances, we only steal human property, but when we steal, or retain men in slavery, we seize those who, in common with ourselves, are constituted by the original grant lords of the earth."

But the church contented itself with recording its doctrine. No rules of discipline were enforced. The slave-holders remained in the church, adding slave to slave, unmolested; not only unmolested, but bearing the offices of the church. In 1816, the general assembly, while it called slavery "a mournful evil," directed the ERASURE of the note to the eighth commandment. In 1818, it adopted an "EXPRESSION OF VIEWS" in which slavery is called "a gross violation of the most precious and sacred rights of human nature," but instead of requiring the instant abandonment of this "violation of rights," the assembly exhorts the violators "to continue and increase their exertions to effect a total abolition of slavery, with no greater delay than a regard to the public welfare demands," and recommends that if a "christian professor shall sell a slave who is also in communion with our church," without the consent of the slave,

the seller should be "suspended till he should repent and make reparation."

The reality of slavery in the presbyterian church, since 1818, may be known from the following testimonies:—

The Rev. James Smylie, A. M., of the Amite Presbytery, Mississippi, in a pamphlet, published by him a short time ago in favour of American slavery, says:—

"If slavery be a sin, and advertising and apprehending slaves, with a view to restore them to their masters, is a direct violation of the Divine law, and if the buying, selling, or holding a slave FOR THE SAKE OF GAIN, is a heinous sin and scandal, then, verily, THREE-FOURTHS OF ALL THE EPISCOPALIANS, METHODISTS, BAPTISTS, and PRESBYTERIANS, IN ELEVEN STATES OF THE UNION, are of the devil. They 'hold,' if they do not buy and sell slaves, and, with few exceptions they hesitate not to 'apprehend and restore' runaway slaves, when in their power."

In 1834, the Synod of Kentucky appointed a committee of twelve to report on the condition, &c., of the slaves. This passage occurs in the report:—

"Brutal stripes and all the various kinds of personal indignities, are not the only species of cruelty which slavery licenses. The law does not recognise the family relations of the slave; and extends to him no protection in the enjoyment of domestic endearments. The members of a slave family may be forcibly separated, so that they shall never more meet until the final judgment. And cupidity often induces the masters to practice what the law allows. Brothers and sisters, parents and children, husbands and wives are torn asunder, and permitted to see each other no more. *These acts are daily occurring in the midst of us.* The shrieks and the agony, often witnessed on such occasions, proclaim with a trumpet-tongue, the iniquity and cruelty of our system. The cries of these sufferers go up to the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth. There is not a neighbourhood, where these heart-rending scenes are not displayed. There is not a village or road that does not behold the sad procession of manacled outcasts, whose chains and mournful countenances tell that they are exiled by force from all that their hearts held dear. Our church, years ago, raised its voice of solemn warning against the flagrant violation of every principle of mercy, justice, and humanity. Yet we blush to announce to you and to the world, that this warning has been often disregarded, even by those who hold to our communion. Cases have often occurred in our own denomination, where professors of the religion of mercy have torn the mother from her children, and sent her into a merciless and returnless exile. Yet acts of discipline have rarely [never] followed such conduct."

In 1835, Mr. Stewart, of Illinois, a ruling elder, in a speech urging the general assembly of which he was a member, to act on the subject of slavery, bears this testimony to the existing state of things in the presbyterian church.

"I hope this assembly are prepared to come out fully and declare their sentiments, that slaveholding is a most flagrant, and heinous sin. Let us not pass it by in this indirect way, while so many thousands and tens of thousands of our fellow-creatures are writhing under the lash, often inflicted, too, by ministers and elders of the presbyterian church.

"In this church, a man may take a free-born child, force it away from its parents, to whom God gave it in charge, saying, 'Bring it up for me,' and sell it as a beast or hold it in perpetual bondage, and not only escape corporal punishment, but really be esteemed an excellent christian. Nay, even ministers of the gospel, and doctors of divinity, may engage in this unholy traffic, and yet sustain their high and holy calling.

"Elders, ministers, and doctors of divinity, are with both hands, engaged in the practice."

The speech from which the above is extracted, was made in support of various memorials and petitions from members of the presbyterian church, asking that the general assembly might proceed to carry out its principles as they were avowed in 1794 and in 1818. Nothing was done this session, further than to refer all such memorials and petitions to a committee, (a majority of whom was known to be opposed to the prayer of the memorialists,) to report at the next session in 1836.

At the meeting of the assembly in 1836, the first thing that was done, —to conciliate the excited slave-holders—was to elect one of them to be *Moderator*.

The majority of the committee appointed in 1835, of which the Rev. Samuel Miller, D. D., and theological professor, was chairman, did accordingly report at the session of 1836, as follows:—

"That after the most mature deliberation, which they have been able to bestow on the interesting and important question referred to them they would most respectfully recommend to the general assembly, the adoption of the following preamble, and resolution

"Whereas, the subject of slavery is inseparably connected with the laws of many of the states in this union, with which it is by no means proper for an ecclesiastical judicatory to interfere, and involves many considerations in regard to which great diversity of opinion and intensity of feeling are known to exist in the churches represented in this assembly: And whereas, there is great reason to believe, that any action on the part of this assembly in reference to this subject, would tend to distract and divide our churches, and would probably, in nowise promote the benefit of those whose welfare is immediately contemplated in the memorials in question."

Therefore, resolved,—1. "That it is not expedient for the assembly to take any further order in relation to this subject.

2. "That as the notes which have been expunged from our public formularies, and which some of the memorials referred to the committee request to have restored, were introduced irregularly—never had the sanction of the church—and therefore, never possessed any authority—the general assembly has no power, nor would they think it expedient to assign them a place in the authorized standards of the church."

The minority of the committee, the Reverends Messrs. Dickey and Beman, reported the following resolution:—

Resolved,—1. "That the buying, selling, or holding a human being as property, is in the sight of God a heinous sin, and ought to subject the doer of it to the censures of the church."

2. "That it is the duty of every one, and especially of every christian, who may be involved in this sin, to free himself from its entanglement without delay.

3. "That it is the duty of every one, especially of every christian, in

the meekness and firmness of the gospel, to plead the cause of the poor and needy by testifying against the principle and practice of slaveholding; and to use his best endeavours to deliver the church of God from the evil; and to bring about the emancipation of the slaves in these United States, and throughout the world."

The slaveholding delegates to the number of forty-eight, met apart, and resolved,—

"That if the general assembly shall undertake to exercise authority on the subject of slavery, so as to make it an immorality, or shall in any way declare that christians are criminal in holding slaves, that a declaration shall be presented by the southern delegation, declining their jurisdiction in the case, and our determination not to submit to such decision."

At an adjourned meeting they adopted the following preamble and resolution, to be presented in the assembly, as a substitute for those of Dr. Miller:—

"Whereas, the subject of slavery is inseparably connected with the laws of many of the states of this Union, in which it exists under the sanction of said laws, and of the constitution of the United States; and whereas, slavery is recognized in both the Old and New Testaments as an existing relation, and is not condemned by the authority of God; therefore resolved,—The general assembly have no authority to assume or exercise jurisdiction, in regard to the existence of slavery."

The whole subject was finally disposed of by the adoption of the following preamble and resolution:—

"Inasmuch as the constitution of the presbyterian church, in its preliminary and fundamental principles, declares that no church judicatories ought to pretend to make laws to bind the conscience *in virtue of their authority*; and as the urgency of the business of the assembly, and the shortness of the time during which they can continue in session, render it impossible to deliberate and decide judiciously on the subject of slavery in its relation to the church; therefore, resolved,—That this whole subject be indefinitely postponed."

A large number of memorials and petitions went up to the general assembly of 1837. They were referred to a committee of which the Rev. Dr. Witherspoon, a slave-holder of South Carolina—the same who was moderator the year before—was chairman. After detaining them till nearly the usual time for the final adjournment of the assembly, he reported that "the committee had had a number of papers submitted to them from various synods, churches, and individuals, men and women, on the subject of slavery: and the committee had unanimously agreed, (with the exception of a single member,) to direct that they be returned to the house; and that he should move to lay the whole subject on the table," which was accordingly done by a vote of 97 to 28.

In 1838, the presbyterian church separated on doctrinal differences. Instead of one general assembly, there were now two, known as the "old school," and the "new school." In the *convention* which was held by the old school preparatory to the separation it was resolved:—

"That in the judgment of this convention, it is of the greatest consequence to the best interests of our church, that the subject of slavery shall not be agitated or discussed in the sessions of the ensuing general assembly, and if any motion shall be made, or resolution offered, touching the same, this convention is of opinion that the members of convention in that body ought to unite in disposing of it, as far as may be possible without debate."

Since the separation, the course of the old school has been regulated by the spirit of this resolution. It has done nothing on the subject.

Petitions and memorials against slavery were presented, in the new school assembly, at its first session in 1838, and referred to a committee, which reported—"that the applicants for reasons satisfactory to themselves have withdrawn their papers." The committee was discharged.

In 1839, it referred the whole subject to the presbyteries to do what they might deem advisable.

In 1840, a large number of memorials and petitions against slavery was sent in, and referred to the usual committee. The committee reported a resolution—referring to what had been done last year—declaring it *inexpedient for the assembly to do anything further on the subject*. Several attempts were made by the abolition-members of the Assembly to obtain a decided expression of its views, but they proved ineffectual, and the whole subject was *indefinitely postponed*. Why, it may be asked—especially by those who, at the time the separation took place, flattered themselves that the new school would show itself *really* opposed to slavery—Why, has such been brought about? The answer is plain: the new school assembly is more solicitous to have the favour of the few slaveholders who are members, than to have the blessings of the poor who are perishing in their grasp—more earnest to equal the old school in numbers than to outstrip it in righteousness.

SENTIMENTS OF PRESBYTERIES AND SYNODS.

Although many of the influential presbyterian ministers in the free states, especially in the cities and large towns, have shown themselves ready to second the slaveholding ministers and laymen in their opposition to abolitionism, from some cause it has happened that the free-state presbyteries and synods, have not committed themselves *directly* on the question. They have attempted to stay the progress of abolitionism by resolutions bearing on it *indirectly*; but well understood by those who were to act under them as intended to exclude as far as was safe, the question of abolition from the churches. Such resolutions of presbyterian councils as are at hand, have been passed by presbyteries and synods in the slave states.

HOPEWELL PRESBYTERY SOUTH CAROLINA:

1. "Slavery has existed in the church of God from the time of Abraham to this day. Members of the church of God have held slaves bought with their money, and born in their houses; and this relation is not only recognized, but its duties are defined clearly both in the Old and New Testaments.

2. "Emancipation is not mentioned among the duties of the master to his slave, while obedience 'even to the froward' master is enjoined upon the slave.

3. "No instance can be produced of an otherwise orderly christian being *REPROVED*, much less *EXCOMMUNICATED* from the church, for the single act of holding domestic slaves, from the days of Abraham down to the date of the modern abolitionist."

HARMONY PRESBYTERY OF SOUTH CAROLINA:

"Whereas, sundry persons in Scotland and England, and others in the north, east, and west of our country, have denounced slavery

as obnoxious to the laws of God, some of whom have presented before the general assembly of our church, and the Congress of the nation, memorials and petitions, with the avowed object of bringing into disgrace slave-holders, and abolishing the relation of master and slave:—And whereas, from the said proceedings, and the statements, reasonings, and circumstances connected therewith, it is most manifest that those persons ‘know not what they say, nor whereof they affirm; and with this ignorance discover a spirit of self-righteousness and exclusive sanctity,’ &c.

Therefore, 1. Resolved,—“That as the kingdom of our Lord is not of this world, His church as such has no right to abolish, alter, or effect any institution or ordinance of men, political or civil, &c.

2. Resolved:—“That slavery has existed from the days of those good old slave-holders and patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, (who are now in the kingdom of heaven,) to the time when the apostle Paul sent a runaway home to his master, Philemon, and wrote a christian and fraternal letter to this slave-holder, which we find still stands in the canon of the scriptures—and that slavery has existed ever since the days of the apostle, and does now exist.

3. Resolved:—“That as the relative duties of master and slave are taught in the scriptures, in the same manner as those of parent and child, and husband and wife, the existence of slavery itself is not opposed to the will of God; and whosoever has a conscience too tender to recognize this relation as lawful, is ‘righteous over much,’ is ‘wise above what is written,’ and has submitted his neck to the yoke of men, sacrificed his christian liberty of conscience, and leaves the infallible word of God for the fancies and doctrines of men.”

CHARLESTON UNION PRESBYTERY:

“It is a principle which meets the views of this body, that slavery, as it exists among us, is a political institution, with which ecclesiastical judicatories have not the smallest right to interfere; and in relation to which, any such interference, especially at the present momentous crisis, would be *morally wrong*, and fraught with the most dangerous and pernicious consequences. The sentiments which we maintain, *in common with Christians at the south, of every denomination*, are sentiments which so fully approve themselves to our consciences, are so identified with our solemn convictions of duty, that we should maintain them under any circumstances.”

Resolved,—“That in the opinion of this Presbytery, the holding of slaves, so far from being a *sin* in the sight of God, is no where condemned in his holy word—that it is in accordance with the example, or consistent with the precepts of patriarchs, apostles, and prophets, and that it is compatible with the most fraternal regard to the best good of those servants whom God may have committed to our charge; and that, therefore, they who assume the contrary position, and lay it down as a fundamental principle in morals and religion, that all slaveholding is wrong, proceed upon false principles.”

SYNOD OF SOUTH CAROLINA AND GEORGIA:

Resolved, unanimously,—[Dec., 1834.] “That in the opinion of this Synod, Abolition Societies, and the principles on which they are founded, in the United States, are inconsistent with the interests of the slaves, the rights of the holders, and the great principles of our political institution.

SYNOD OF VIRGINIA:

“The committee to whom were referred the resolutions, &c., have according to order, had the same under consideration—and respectfully report that in their judgment, the following resolutions are necessary and proper to be adopted by the Synod at the present time.”

“Whereas, the publications and proceedings of certain organized associations, commonly called anti-slavery, or abolition societies, which have arisen in some parts of our land, have greatly disturbed and are still greatly disturbing the peace of the church, and of the country; and the Synod of Virginia deem it a solemn duty which they owe to themselves and to the community to declare their sentiments upon the subject; therefore,

Resolved, unanimously,—“That we consider the dogma fiercely promulgated by said associations—that slavery as it exists in our slaveholding states is necessarily sinful, and ought to be immediately abolished, and the conclusions which naturally follow from that dogma, as directly and palpably contrary to the plainest principles of common sense and common humanity, and to the clearest authority of the word of God.”

The above are all of the old school. The following is from a slaveholding new school church, in Petersburg, Virginia, (16th Nov., 1838):—

“Whereas, the General Assembly did, in the year 1818, pass a law which contains provisions for slaves, irreconcilable with our civil institutions, and solemnly declaring slavery to be a sin against God—a law at once offensive and insulting to the whole southern community.”

1. Resolved,—“That, as slave-holders, we cannot consent longer to remain in connexion with any church where there exists a statute conferring the right upon slaves to arraign their masters before the judiciary of the church—and that *too for the act of selling them without their consent first had and obtained*.”

2. “That as the Great Head of the church has recognized the relation of master and slave, we conscientiously believe that slavery is not a sin against God as declared by the General Assembly.”

3. “That there is no tyranny more oppressive than that which is sometimes sanctioned by the operation of ecclesiastical law.”

SENTIMENTS OF PRESBYTERIAN MINISTERS.

THE REV. GARDINER SPRING, D.D., of New York:

At the anniversary of the American colonization society at the city of Washington, in 1839, this gentleman appeared on the platform as one of the speakers, with Mr. George D. Wise, (M.C.) of Virginia, a slaveholder and professed duellist. The latter had said in his speech, *the best way to meet the abolitionists was with “Dupont’s best,” [gunpowder] and cold steel.* The Sun, one of the New York city journals, tells us—the Rev. Doctor “spoke with sympathy of the sentiments of the South as evinced in the speech of Mr. Wise.”

Since this, Dr. S. has preached a series of sermons to his congregation on slavery in its scriptural relations. These sermons have been printed, and are looked on by the pro-slavery party as highly serviceable to their cause.

THE REV. JOEL PARKER, D.D. PRESIDENT OF THE PRESBYTERIAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, New York:—

“Abolition might be pronounced a sin as well as slavery.”

This was said, according to the American papers, at the last session of the (N. S.) general assembly, in supporting the proposition of a slaveholder, that “all action on the subject of slavery, should be declared by that body beyond its relations and functions.”

The Rev. Dr. P. at the beginning of the Anti-slavery movement in the United States was an abolitionist. He was sent to New Orleans, being thought eminently fitted as a christian minister, to contend, against the prevailing iniquities of that slaveholding city. He had not been there long, before he became a *colonizationist*. He happened to be at Alton, (Illinois) at the time the mob spirit was beginning to show its bloody intents toward the Rev. Mr. Lovejoy. His injurious remarks in public against the abolitionists were thought to have contributed,—without having been so intended—to excite the mob to the fatal issue which took place. He afterwards returned to New York; was elected pastor of the Tabernacle church, of which Mr. Lewis Tappan was a member; resisted the formation by that gentleman of an Anti-slavery society among the members of the church; prosecuted Mr. T. before the church sessions, on various charges, with the view of ejecting him from the church, and has, generally, since his return to New York, distinguished himself by bitterness of spirit and language against the Anti-slavery cause. Since all which, he has been made a D.D. and president of the (N. S.) Theological Seminary in New York.

THE REV. SAMUEL H. COX, D.D. of the City of Brooklyn: moved the indefinite postponement of the slavery question at the last (N. S.) general assembly. On the motion being carried, he exultingly said, “Our Vesuvius is safely capped for three years”—the assembly not meeting again till 1843. Dr. Cox was at one time an abolitionist.

THE (LATE) REV. JOHN H. RICE, D.D. of Virginia, Theological Professor, &c.

“I am most fully convinced that slavery is the greatest evil in our country except *Whiskey*.”

THE REV. WILLIAM S. PLUMMER, D.D. of Richmond:

[This gentleman is one of the old school party. He was absent from Richmond at the time the clergy in that city purged themselves in a body, from the charge of being favourably disposed to abolition. [See page 9.] On his return, he lost no time in communicating to the “chairman of the committee of correspondence,” his agreement with his clerical brethren. The passages quoted, occur in his letter to the chairman.]

“I have carefully watched this matter from its earliest existence, and everything I have seen or heard of its character, both from its patrons and its enemies, has confirmed me, beyond repentance, in the belief, that, let the character of Abolitionists be what it may in the sight of the Judge of all the earth, this is the most meddlesome, impudent, reckless, fierce, and wicked excitement I ever saw.

“If Abolitionists will set the country in a blaze, it is but fair that they should receive the first warming at the fire.

“Let it be proclaimed throughout the nation, that every movement made by the fanatics (so far as it has any effect in the south) does but rivet every fetter of the bondsman—diminish the probability of anything being successfully undertaken for making him either fit for freedom, or likely to obtain it. We have the authority of Montesquieu, Burke, and Coleridge, three eminent masters of the science of human nature, that of all men, slave-holders are the most jealous of their liberties. One of Pennsylvania’s most gifted sons has lately pronounced the south, the *cradle of liberty*.

“Lastly.—Abolitionists are like infidels, wholly unaddicted to martyrdom for opinion’s sake. Let them understand that *they will be caught*. [Lynched] if they come among us, and they will take good heed to keep out of our way. There is not one man among them who has any more idea of shedding his blood in this cause, than he has of making war on the Grand Turk.”

Rev. Thomas S. Witherspoon, of Alabama, writing to the Editor of the Emancipator:—

“I draw my warrant from the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, to hold the slave in bondage. The principle of holding the heathen in bondage is recognized by God. * * * When the tardy process of the law is too long in redressing our grievances, we of the South, have adopted the summary remedy of Judge Lynch—and really I think it one of the most wholesome and salutary remedies for the malady of northern fanaticism that can be applied, and no doubt my worthy friend, the editor of the Emancipator and Human Rights, would feel the better of its enforcement, provided he had a southern administrator. I go to the Bible for my warrant in all moral matters. * * Let your emissaries dare venture to cross the Potomac, and I cannot promise you that their fate will be less than Haman’s. Then beware how you goad an insulted, but magnanimous people to deeds of desperation.”

Rev. Robert N. Anderson, of Virginia:

“To the Sessions of the Presbyterian Congregations within the bounds of the West Hanover Presbytery:—

“At the approaching stated meeting of our Presbytery, I design to offer a preamble and string of resolutions on the subject of the use of wine in the Lord’s supper; and also a preamble and string of resolutions on the subject of the treasonable and abominably wicked interference of the Northern and Eastern fanatics, with our political and civil rights, our property, and our domestic concerns. You are aware that our clergy, whether with or without reason, are more suspected by the public than the clergy of other denominations. Now, dear christian brethren, I humbly express it as my earnest wish, that you *quit yourselves like men*. If there be any stray goat of a minister among you, tainted with the bloodhounds principles of abolitionism, let him be ferreted out, silenced, excommunicated, and left to the public to dispose of him in other respects.

“Your affectionate brother in the Lord,
ROBERT N. ANDERSON.”

THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

The number of members in this church is not known. It is, however, small when compared with the number in any of the churches that have been mentioned. Its congregations are mostly in the cities and towns, and they generally consist of persons in the wealthier classes of society. This, together with the smallness of its numbers and the authority of the bishops, has prevented it from being much agitated with the anti-slavery question. Its leading ministers, so far as they concern themselves at all about the slavery question, are in favour of the American Colonization scheme. Their influence is, therefore, decidedly adverse to emancipation. The prevailing temper of the Protestant Episcopal church is thus testified of by John Jay, Esq., of the city of New York,—himself an Episcopalian—in a pamphlet, entitled “Thoughts on the duty of the Episcopal church in relation to slavery!”—

“Alas! for the expectation that she would conform to the spirit of her ancient mother. She has not merely remained a mute and careless spectator of this great conflict of truth and justice with hypocrisy and cruelty, but her very priests and deacons may be seen ministering at the altar of slavery, offering their talents and influence at its unholy shrine, and openly repeating the awful blasphemy, that the precepts of our Saviour sanction the system of American slavery. Her northern (free state) clergy, with rare exceptions, whatever they may feel upon this subject, rebuke it neither in public nor in private; and her periodicals, far from advancing the progress of abolition, at times oppose our societies, impliedly defending slavery, as not incompatible with christianity, and occasionally withholding information useful to the cause of freedom.”

Although apparently desirous of keeping clear of all connexion with the anti-slavery movement, the Episcopalians have not failed, when a suitable opportunity presented itself, to throw their influence against it.

The Rev. Peter Williams, rector of St. Philip’s church, New York, a coloured gentleman, was one of the executive committee of the American Anti-slavery society, in 1834, when the abolitionists were exposed in their persons and property to the fiercest onsets of pro-slavery mobs. The bishop of the diocese [Rev. Benjamin F. Onderdonk, D.D.] required of Mr. Williams to relinquish his place in the committee, to which requisition Mr. W. thought it his duty to conform.

Bishop Bowen of Charleston, South Carolina, not long after the meeting in that city, in which the “reverend gentlemen of the clergy,” had so handsomely and unanimously “responded to public sentiment,” volunteered in an address to the convention of his diocese, a denunciation of the “malignant philanthropy of abolition,” and contrasted “the savagery and outlawry consequent on abolition,” with “domestic servitude under the benign influence of christian principles and christian institutions!—principles and institutions which denied Sunday-school instruction to free-coloured children, and which, at the very time of the address, tolerated the offer in the *Charleston Courier* of fifty dollars for the head of a fugitive slave—principles and institutions which led Mr. Preston to declare in his place as a senator of the United States, “Let an abolitionist come within the borders of South Carolina—if we can catch him we will hang him.”

In 1836, a clergyman in North Carolina, of the name of Freeman, preached, in the presence of his Bishop (Rev. Levi S. Ives, D.D., a native of a free state,) two sermons on the rights and duties of slaveholders. In these he essayed to justify from the Bible, the slavery both of white men and negroes, and insisted that “without a new revelation from heaven no man was authorized to pronounce slavery wrong.” The sermons were printed in a pamphlet, prefaced with a letter to Mr. Freeman from the Bishop of North Carolina, declaring that he had “listened with most unfeigned pleasure” to his discourses, and advised their publication as being “urgently called for at the present time.” The Protestant Episcopal Society for the advancement of christianity in South Carolina thought it expedient, and in all likelihood with Bishop Bowen’s approbation, to republish Mr. Freeman’s pamphlet as a religious tract!

The Churchman is edited by a Doctor of Divinity, late an instructor in a theological seminary, and enjoys the especial patronage of the Bishop of New York, and was recently officially recommended by him to the favour of the Convention. The editor has frequently assailed the abolitionists in his columns in bitter and contemptuous terms. He has even volunteered to defend the most cruel and iniquitous enactment of the slave code. In reference to the legal prohibition of teaching the coloured population to read, the editor says—“All the knowledge which is necessary to salvation, all the knowledge of our duty toward God, and our duty toward our neighbour, may be communicated by oral instruction, and therefore a law of the land interdicting other means of instruction does not trench upon the law of God.”

A certain congregation in the diocese of New York is said to hold its cemetery by a tenure which forbids the interment of any coloured person; so that if an episcopal coloured clergyman happen to die in that parish, he would be indebted to others than his episcopal brethren for a grave!

There are instances of regularly ordained ministers, rectors of parishes—men having as valid a commission to preach the gospel as any other presbyters in the episcopal church, who are virtually denied a seat in her ecclesiastical councils, solely because they are men of colour. The rector of a coloured church in Philadelphia is excluded by an express canon of the diocesan convention.

“THE GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES,” is in the city of New York. It is called the general seminary, because it is under the superintendence of the whole church; the board of trustees being composed of the bishops *ex-officio*, and upwards of one hundred clerical and lay gentlemen, representing the different states and territories of the union. It was intended, of course, for the theological education of the protestant episcopal ministry.

Alexander Crummel, a coloured young gentleman of New York, made application to become a “candidate for holy orders” in the church, and was duly admitted as such. In due time Mr. Crummel received from the bishop of the diocese, the usual circular in such cases, in which he was told “unless you belong to the general theological seminary, as it is my wish that all the candidates of this diocese should, when not prevented by unavoidable circumstances, you will be governed,” &c.

The section in the statutes of the seminary regulating admission is plain and imperative:—“Every person producing to the faculty satisfactory evidence of his having been admitted a candidate for holy orders,” &c., “shall be received as a student of the seminary.”

It does not appear from the only account we have at hand, of this matter, that Mr. Crummel made application to the faculty. It is however,

to be presumed he did, and that the faculty put him off by referring him to the board of trustees. To the board then, he made his application, of which an account is given in the following.

EXTRACT FROM THE MINUTES:—

“Tuesday, June 25th, 1839.

“A communication from Mr. Crummel, asking admission to the Seminary as a student was read, and on motion referred to a Committee consisting of the following gentlemen, appointed by the chair:—Right Rev. Bishop Doane, Rev. Drs. Milnor, Taylor and Smith, Messrs. D. B. Ogden, Newton and Johnson.”

“June 26th, 1839.

“The Right Rev. Bishop Doane, chairman of the Committee on the petition of Mr. Crummel, asked to be relieved from further service on that Committee, which request was granted.

“The Right Rev. Bishop Onderdonk, of Pennsylvania, was on motion appointed chairman of the committee, to fill the vacancy thus occasioned.”

“June 27th, 1839.

“The committee on the petition of Mr. Crummel, submitted the following:—

“The committee to whom was referred the petition of Mr. Crummel, respectfully report that having *deliberately* considered the said petition they are of the opinion that it ought not to be granted, and they accordingly recommend to the Board of Trustees the following resolution:—Resolved,—That the prayer of the petitioner be not granted.

“The Rev. Dr. Hawks,* moved that the resolution recommended in the report be adopted.”

Mr. Huntingdon moved,—

“That the whole subject be recommitted, with instructions to the committee to report, that the matters embraced in the petition of Mr. Crummel, are, according to Section 1, of Chap. VII. of the Statutes, referrible to the faculty rather than this board”—*which motion was lost.*

[Through fear, we are constrained to believe lest the faculty would not, if compelled to act, refuse to Mr. Crummel a right that was so obviously his.]

Whereupon the question upon accepting the report and adopting the resolution recommended, was taken up and decided in the affirmative.

The Right Rev. Bishop Doane gave notice, that he should, on the morrow, ask leave to present to the board, and to enter upon the minutes, a *protest* against this decision.

“Friday, June 28.

“The Right Rev. Bishop Doane, who had yesterday given notice of his intention to ask leave to enter a protest, &c. changed his intention as to the manner of presenting the subject, and asked leave to state to the board his reasons, with a view to the entering of the same on the minutes, for dissenting from the vote of the majority on the report of the committee, to whom was referred the petition of Mr. Crummel. *Leave was not granted.*”

During these proceedings, attempts were made by the bishop of New York, to prevail on Mr. Crummel to withdraw his application for admission, by assuring him “the members of the faculty were willing to impart to him [private] instruction in their respective departments; and that more evil than benefit would result both to the church and himself, by a formal application in his behalf for admission into the seminary.”

The reader will not have failed to notice with what care every allusion to the cause of refusing Mr. Crummel admission is excluded from the minutes and to feel that the very fact that the cause does not appear in the minutes—leaving it to be inferred, that it was for something too base to be recorded there—is an act of injustice to him that admits of no excuse.†

“An Episcopalian” of New York, jealous for the honour of his church, published in one of the journals of that city, a full account of these proceedings. The bishop of New York, made a short reply, to but one of his statements, (an immaterial one) and concluded by saying, that in the discharge of his duties and responsibilities, he should not certainly be swayed by any appeal that might be made to popular feeling.

POSTSCRIPT.

We would have the reader bear in mind, that the foregoing presents but one side of the anti-slavery cause in the several churches whose proceedings have been considered; and that in them all, there are abolitionists earnestly labouring to purify them from the defilements of slavery; and that they have strong encouragement to proceed, not only in view of what they have already effected toward that end, but in the steady increase of their numbers, and in other omens of success.

We wish him also to bear in mind, that the churches which have been brought before him are not the only American churches which are guilty in giving their support to slavery. Of others we have said nothing, simply because, to examine their causes, would be to make this work too long for the object we have in view—and because enough has been said to show substantially the state of the slavery-question in America, so far as the CHURCH in that country is connected with it.

Lastly.—We take pleasure in assuring him, that there are considerable portions of the Methodist—Baptist—and Presbyterian churches, as well as the entire of some of the smaller religious bodies in America, that maintain a commendable testimony against slavery and its abominations.

* Dr. Hawks is the Historian of the Episcopal church in the United States. If it be true, as we have seen stated in an American newspaper, that this gentleman is himself of mixed blood—and his complexion a little favours the statement—it proves that the admision does not deteriorate the intellectual powers; for in the oratory of the pulpit, and as a writer, Dr. H. stands, deservedly, among the distinguished men of America.

† Mr. Crummel proposed a short time since, becoming a student in the Andover (Massachusetts) Theological Seminary—a congregational institution—where we presume, he is now preparing himself for orders in the protestant episcopal church.